

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

277

N26

Vol. 4

GENERAL HISTORY
OF THE
CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH:

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF
DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER,
BY
JOSEPH TORREY,
PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

NEW EDITION, CAREFULLY REVISED

“Let both grow together until the harvest” — *Words of our Lord*
“Les uns Christiansant le civil et le politique les autres civilisant la
Christianisme, il se forma de ce melange un monstre — *St Martin.*”

VOLUME FOURTH.

LONDON:
HENRY G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.
1851.

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET.

CONTENTS OF VOL: IV.

SECTION FOURTH—continued.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY APPREHENDED AND DEVELOPED AS A SYSTEM
OF DOCTRINES—continued.

Oppositions in the mode of apprehending and treating the Single Great Doctrines of Christianity, 1.

*Theology in the stricter sense of the word, or the Christian Doctrine concerning
God, 1.*

	Page
Development of this doctrine in the preceding period: the Western system and its predominant interest in behalf of the unity of essence—the Oriental system of emanation and subordination	1
Dionysius of Rome, and Dionysius of Alexandria	2

Doctrine of Arius, 3.

Arius educated at Antioch. His tendency to rest in the limi- tations of the understanding. Wanted the intuitive faculty. Is not conscious of teaching a new doctrine	3
The Logos had a beginning of existence—was created from nothing—is called metonymically "Son of God," as being the most perfect creature: by whom the rest of creation was produced. Christ possesses by nature a mutable will (he makes the humanization of the Logos to consist merely in his being united with a human body), yet calls him "God"—that is, by the communication of grace, not in essence—the essence of God incomprehensible even to the Son	4—8
Character of his system	8

Beginning of the Arian Controversy, 9—18.

Arius, a presbyter and pastor in Alexandria, venerated on ac- count of his rigidly ascetic life, deposed in the year 321 by his bishop, Alexander, who was devoted to the doctrine of Homoousion	9—10
The work of Arius entitled "Thalia"	10
Alexander's circular letter; and endeavours of Arius to inter-	

est in his favour the bishops of the Oriental church, who were for the most part inclined to the system of Origen . . .	Page 11
Efforts to bring about a conciliation by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and by Eusebius of Cæsarea, who was opposed to controversy on divine things. [Essentially Origenistic system of the latter.] His incorrect judgment with respect to the importance of the matters in dispute. Arius favourably disposed. Alexander disinclined to his mediation . . .	12—16
Constantine, indifferent to these matters, is vexed by this division, and publishes a letter of conciliation, which is without effect . . .	16—17
<i>First ecumenical Council of Nice, A.D. 325, 18.</i>	
[Critical examination of the diverging reports of Eusebius and of Athanasius] . . .	19
The three parties: <i>Arians</i> , Homoousians, and the more numerous party, who held the middle ground between the two others,—afterwards called <i>Semi-Arians</i> . . .	19—20
Eusebius of Cæsarea as a pacificator: his symbol of faith made up for the most part of scriptural phrases . . .	21
The party of Alexander, and with it, at present, also Constantine, demand the Homoousion and antithetic clauses or articles against Arianism. <i>The Nicene creed</i> . . .	22—24
Eusebius, who at first refuses acquiescence, finally yields, for the sake of peace, explaining, like many of the others, the Homoousion in the sense of Homoiousion . . .	25—26
Creed subscribed, and Arius condemned . . .	27
Persecutions of Arius and his party . . .	27
Reaction against this forced result. Constantine changes sides. Arius recalled, A.D. 328 or 329—his confession of faith. Principle of the then existing theology of court,—to represent doctrinal difference as of no importance . . .	28—30
<i>Athanasius bishop of Alexandria, 30, ff.</i>	
Already, while a presbyter, the soul of the contest against Arius—acute, consistent, firm, and unwavering . . .	30
The Homoousion for him the central point of the Christian consciousness of God: Christ can introduce men to fellowship with God only by being God in essence. Attacks the Arian definition of the phrases “Son of God,” and “generation from God” . . .	31—32
His resolute and repeated refusal, in spite of the emperor’s threats, to re-admit Arius to his standing. Personal appearance before the emperor . . .	32—33
Renewed charges against Athanasius, and hence the synod of Tyre in 335. Athanasius deposed, appeals to the emperor, who banishes him, however, A.D. 336, to Trier . . .	34—36
Purposed restoration of Arius. His second confession of faith. His sudden death and its consequences. Explicit condemnation of Arianism on the part of the head party in the	

East, merely for the purpose of asserting their opposition to the Homousion	Page 36—40
Constantine's death, A.D. 337. Constantius, an emperor who too much affected the theologian, won over to the side of Arianism : disputatious spirit at Constantinople	40—41
Athanasius sent back to Alexandria by Constantine the younger, and received there with enthusiasm. New intrigues of his adversaries. Their ecclesiastical assembly at Antioch, A.D. 341. Deposition of Athanasius confirmed. Delegates from both parties sent to Julius of Rome. Protest of the Orientals against his supreme judicial authority	42—44
Gregory forced as bishop upon the people of Alexandria. Athanasius flees to Rome—there recognised, by a synod held in 342, as a regular bishop. Letter of Julius to the Orientals	44
Meetings of the Orientals (who in the West were generally regarded as Arians) at Antioch, A.D. 341 and 345, with their five symbols of faith. Points of difference between them and the Nicene creed ;—they condemn Arianism, but do not admit the unity of essence, nor a generation of the Logos grounded in the essential being of God] . . .	45—46
Convocation of a general council at Sardica, A.D. 347, by Constantius and Constans : the Orientals present only in small numbers,—secede on account of Athanasius, repair to Philippopolis, and draw up a new creed. At Sardica the Nicene creed retained	46—47
Return of Athanasius brought about by Constans	48—49
[Diversity of reports respecting the particular circumstances]	49
Death of Constans. New complaints against Athanasius. Attack on Marcellus of Ancyra and Photinus of Sirmium, aimed indirectly against Athanasius	49—50
Marcellus, a warm advocate of the Homousion and opponent of the Origenistic theology ;—his approximation to Sabellianism—the <i>ἡνωχθίζειν</i> of the Logos in the divine Being, and his <i>ἐνέργεια θεαστική</i> . (See Exposit. of Col. i. 15) . .	50—51
Deposed as early as 336 : the two works of Eusebius of Cesarea against him : at a later period returns to his bishopric. Photinus, his disciple, openly professes Sabellianism. Both deposed by the synod at Sirmium, in 351	51—52
Athanasius condemned at the church conventions in Arles and in Milan, A.D. 355, where a part of the Occidentals themselves are overreached by the court party	53
Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Hilary of Poitiers zealous defenders of his innocence.	53
Unsought agreement of the latter with the Nicene creed . . .	54
His own free-spirited, and Lucifer of Cagliari's passionate memorial to the emperor	54—55
Banishment of Liberius of Rome, and Hosius of Cordova . . .	56
Deceitful letter of the emperor to Athanasius. Storming of the church of Athanasius, and establishment of the pas-	

	Page
sionate Georgius in his place by force of arms, in February, 356. Athanasius returns among the Egyptian monks	56—57
Manifestation of differences among the Anti-Nicene party after their triumph over the Homoousians. Strict Arianism taught by Actius and his disciple Eunomius. Doctrine of the latter with regard to the comprehensibility of divine things, and his controversy on this point with Gregory of Nyssa. The essence of religion consists, according to him, in the theoretical knowledge of divine things; according to Gregory, in inward experience	57—62
Eunomius does not wish to be considered an innovator. Doctrine concerning the Son of God as a creature	62—63
Antioch, where Eudoxius was bishop, principal seat of the Eunomians. Violent opposition of the Semi-Arians (Basil of Ancyra).	63
Artifices of the Arian court bishops, Ursacius and Valens, to conceal the difference between the Eunomian and Semi-Arian parties. The use of the unscriptural term <i>oúria</i> represented to the emperor as being the cause of all the disputes	63—64
This term excluded in the symbol of faith drawn up at the council of Sirmium, A.D. 357, which Hosius and Liberius are compelled to subscribe	65
Opposition of the Semi-Arians, headed by Basil of Ancyra and Georgius of Laodicea, at the council of Ancyra, A.D. 358	66
The emperor Constantius hence proposes the holding of a general council—but Ursacius and Valens, dreading a combination of the Semi-Arians and Homoousians, contrive that two separate councils should be held, one at Seleucia in Isauria, the other at Arminium in Italy . . .	67
Their negotiations with Basil and Georgius at the imperial court respecting the creed to be proposed to the councils: The Son is in all respects like the Father, as the scriptures teach; the term <i>oúria</i> must be discarded	67
By various arts they contrive to impose this creed on the Westerns (first on their ten delegates at Nice,) then on the Orientals	69
Confirmation of this creed by a council at Constantinople, A.D. 360.—Pains taken by Eudoxius, then bishop of Constantinople, and by Acacius of Cæsarea, who was averse to doctrinal controversies, in favour of this vapid court-creed. Impatience shown by Constantius at every departure from it; Actius and Eunomius are deposed	70—71
Confusion resulting from this artificial union	71
New turn of affairs consequent on the death of Constantius in 361; particularly to the advantage of the Homoousians . .	72
Spirit of Christian love shown at the council of Alexandria, held under the direction of Athanasius, A.D. 362. Owing, however, to the want of impartiality, a schism continued to exist at Antioch	72—74

Meletian Schism at Antioch, 73.

	Page
Eustathius of Antioch deposed by the Anti-Nicene party about the year 330. Eustathians. Eudoxius is made bishop of Constantinople, A.D. 360, and the Arians choose, as his successor, the Nicene Meletius, not rightly interpreting the moderation of his character. The latter deposed again on account of his Anti-Arian inaugural discourse. The Eustathians, under the presbyter Paulinus, recognised by the Alexandrian synod alone. Lucifer at Antioch ordains Paulinus as bishop. The Western and Alexandrian churches in favour of Paulinus, the Orientals in favour of Meletius	73—75
Lucifer himself the occasion of a separate schism. The Luciferites consider themselves as the only true church	76
Jovinian and Valentinian decline all interference in ecclesiastical affairs. Lamentable disorders in the Oriental church, occasioned by the despotic proceedings of the Arian emperor Valens; which eventually, however, led to a union of the Semi-Arian and Nicene parties, and to the triumph of the latter, which had the advantage of great talents on its side.	76—77
Basil of Cæsarea: Cappadocia preserved by his means from disorders. Respected by the people. His freedom towards the emperor, who does not venture to depose him. (Athanasius, also, is recalled by Valens, through fear of an insurrection)	77—78
Zeal of Basil for the restoration of the peace of the church, especially the churches of the East and West	78
Edict of the year 375, against the abuse of the emperor's name to promote religious persecutions. Triumph of the Homoeousion under Theodosius the Great—his law of the year 380, in favour of the Nicene doctrine.	78
Gregory of Nazianz. His inclination to the contemplative life—his activity as bishop of Sasima, and at Nazianzus as the assistant of his father—retires again to a life of seclusion. Zeal for the faith, perhaps also vanity, brings him to Constantinople—his five temperate discourses in defence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity—hence surnamed the Theologian—his zeal for practical Christianity in opposition to the prevailing inclination to doctrinal discussions	78—80
Entrance of Theodosius into Constantinople, who removes Demophilus and places Gregory in the principal church. Arian assemblies prohibited within the walls of the city	80
Second ecumenical council of Constantinople, A.D. 381	81
Gregory consecrated bishop of Constantinople by Meletius of Antioch	81
Gregory labours ineffectually to do away the Eustathian schism (afterwards disposed of by Alexander of Antioch)	81—82

	Page
Resigns his post. Influence of Gregory of Nyssa on the farther transactions of the council	83
Voluntary adoption of the Nicene creed with the addition of a more precise article in relation to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit	83
<i>Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.</i> Its development. The doctrine at first indistinctly expressed. (Lactantius, Hilary)	84
According to Eunomius, the Holy Spirit is the first creature produced by, the Son, invested with power to sanctify and teach, but without divine or creative power	85
Athanasius, in the consistent development of his own Christian consciousness, is led to apply the Homoeousion also to the Holy Spirit; as certain as the Holy Spirit is the means of fellowship with God, so certainly he must be one with the divine essence	86—87
His influence on the Oriental church, and thus on the council of Constantinople.	87
<i>Germ of the later difference between the Oriental and Western Churches in respect to this doctrine, 88.</i>	
Oriental view: God the Father, the <i>μία ἀρχή</i> , works all things <i>through</i> the Son, <i>in</i> the Holy Spirit; in opposition to the doctrine that “the Spirit is the creature of the Son,” it is held that, as the Son is generated of the Father, so the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father	88
View of the Western church; particularly under the influence of Augustin: Everything communicated by the Father to the Son; the Spirit is one and the same Spirit of both. is the communion of both; that the Spirit proceeds only from the Father, regarded as a remnant of the Arian system of subordination	88—89
Language of Theodore and Theodoret opposed to the creation of the Spirit, and in favour of the procession of the Spirit from the Father	90
Establishment of the doctrine “a patre filioque,” by the third ecclesiastical council of Toledo, A.D. 589, in opposition to Arianism	90
Few opposed to the Nicene creed in the West. Auxentius of Milan, a Semi-Arian. His successor in 374 the former proconsular Ambrose. His decided conduct towards the Arian princess Justina	90—91
Arianism among the rude German tribes. Persecution of the advocates of the Nicene creed by the Vandals in Africa	91—92
Consequences of this new modification of the Nicene creed, which finally obtains the supremacy over the older subordination-system	92
<i>Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ, 92.</i>	
Connection of this doctrine with that concerning the Trinity: the divine and human nature in Christ more accurately	

	Page
distinguished by Homoousians. The Arians, with whom neither the divine nor human nature meets with its just rights, accuse the Homoousians of denying the true personal unity of the God-man	92—93
<i>Doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra, and Photinus</i>	94
<i>Further development of the doctrine of the church in opposition to the Arian and Samosatene systems</i>	94—95
The personal unity and the complete human nature taken into union with the Logos, held fast, notwithstanding the difference of views on other points	95
<i>Influence of the two Gregories, who carried still further the system of Origen</i>	96
Gregory of Nyssa's doctrine concerning the transformation of the human nature after the analogy of the divine, meeting the Eunomian objection to the church doctrine as establishing a duality of existence—hence the ἀντιμίσθισις τῶν ὁνομάτων; his doctrine concerning an intermingling (ἀνακρίσις) of the sensuous element with the essence of the divine nature—hence his theory respecting the omnipresence of Christ's glorified humanity	97
<i>Doctrine of the younger Apollinaris, 98.</i>	
In opposition to the Origenistic theory	98
His interest in behalf of Christian faith combined with the interest of scientific speculation	98
His opposition to the theory of a rational human soul in Christ—its place supplied by the Logos	98—99
His idea of the God-man	99
In Christ there was no human development. Union of the Logos with the complete human nature first takes place in the case of believers	100
His predilection for the interchange of attributes—accuses his opponents of holding to a transformation of Christ's body, and denies the omnipresence of Christ's glorified body	101—102
Does not suppose that he teaches a new doctrine—agrees with others in opposing the Arian doctrine concerning Christ's human nature—supposes himself to have first established the true doctrine of the God-man	104
In opposition to Apollinaris, Athanasius (also Gregory of Nazianz) affirms that Christ, being our pattern, and the redeemer of man's entire nature, must have appropriated the whole of it—the position of Apollinaris, that Christ could not have assumed human nature without sin, leads to the doctrine of the natural necessity of sin	104—105
The scheme of Apollinaris condemned by Western councils, subsequent to the year 375; also by the second ecumenical council, which established, however, no new articles on this point	106
<i>Opposition to the Samosatene and the Apollinarian doctrines,</i>	

	Page
<i>in the schools of Antioch and of Alexandria. Distinctive character of these schools</i>	107
<i>Doctrine of the Antiochian School, 108.</i>	
Conformably to their historico-grammatical tendency, the disciples of this school form their conception of Christ from the gospel history—hence their representation of the purely human nature of Christ without curtailment. Close connection of this view, in the case of Theodore, with his whole doctrinal system.	108
<i>Doctrine of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 108.</i>	
Connection of it with his doctrine of human nature :—the rational nature divided by him into two sections: the <i>mutable</i> , which is capable of being advanced to an <i>immutable</i> nature—man, who is the image of God for all creation, constitutes the medium of this transition—hence it was necessary for Christ to enter into the mutable nature of man, which is subject to temptation—according to the measure of the triumph of his own will in this conflict, was revealed by him the divine power of the Logos constantly united with him, and elevating him from one higher stage to another, as the reward of his merit. Hence Christ possessed more than human knowledge, but not omniscience. Hence he could not send the Holy Spirit until after his glorification	108—110
Maintains, on scriptural grounds, the doctrine of a progressive development of Christ by conflict and exercise, particularly in opposition to Apollinarianism	110—114
Maintains the union of two natures in Christ, in opposition to the interchange of attributes.	115—118
Two natures united, without confusion and without separation, in opposition also to Apollinaris	118—119
<i>Doctrine of the Alexandrian church, 119.</i>	
Gives prominence to the incomprehensible side of the doctrine. Inclined to the interchange of attributes (ἡ θεοτόκος)—yet without confounding the divine and the human	119
The two tendencies compared. Their fundamental difference	121—122

DOCTRINAL CONTROVERSIES.

*Nestorian Disputes, and their Consequences down to the time of the Chalcedonian Council, 123.**Beginning of the Nestorian controversy, 123.*

Nestorius patriarch of Constantinople, subsequent to the year 428—educated in the cloister—wanting in prudence—his zeal against heretics. Sets forth in his sermons the doc-

	Page
trines of the Antiochian schol. Imprudent zeal of his presbyter Anastatius (also of another ecclesiastic) against the term "mother of God" (<i>Θετόκος</i>)	123—127
Disputes concerning the propriety of this term. Nestorius takes the part of his friend	127
Participation of the laity in this dispute	128
Nestorius attacked in a sermon by Proclus, defends himself with moderation. Does not reject the term <i>Θετόκος</i> directly	129—130
Nestorius attacked in various ways by others	131—133
<i>Interference of Cyrill of Alexandria</i>	133
His ambitious and persecuting spirit, coupled with a narrow doctrinal zeal	133—134
His "paschal letter" and "warning," addressed to the Egyptian monks, aimed against Nestorius, though without any mention of his name	134—135
Defends himself against the charge of a contentious spirit and uncharitableness	136
His hypocritical letter addressed to the excited Nestorius	137
Nestorius' dignified reply, and Cyrill's answer to this letter	138
The Alexandrian presbyter Lampon undertakes the part of a mediator; conciliatory letter of Nestorius to Cyrill	139
Cyrill's connexions with the party opposed to Nestorius at Constantinople. Cyrill accused by certain of his own clergy before Nestorius	139—141
His two works against Nestorius, addressed to the emperor and to the Augusta Pulcheria	142
His adulatory report of the dispute to Cœlestin of Rome	143
Letter of Nestorius to Cœlestin; in which also he makes inquiries concerning four deposed Pelagian bishops.	144—145
Cœlestin, under the influence of hierarchical pride, decides in favour of Cyrill	145
A new schism threatens to take place between the East and the West. The Syrian bishops, and especially John patriarch of Antioch, advise Nestorius to yield. His compliant answer, and confidence in a general council	146—148
Cyrill, supported by Rome, grants an arrogant pardon to Nestorius, and pronounces twelve anathemas against the Antiochian system of doctrine	148
Theodore's writings in answer to Cyrill. He censures the confounding together of the language suitable for homilies with the technical language of doctrinal theology—contents especially against the notion of a physical unity in respect to substance (<i>ἑνότης φυσικὴ καὶ ὑπόστασις</i>), as God is thereby subjected to a law of natural necessity. Cyrill's vindication of his anathemas.	149—150
Anti-anathemas of Nestorius	151
Orders for a general council to meet at Ephesus in 431. Letter of Theodosius II. to Cyrill	152
Third ecumenical council at Ephesus, A.D. 431	152

	Page
Candidian, imperial agent appointed with full powers to preserve order in the proceedings of the council. The bishops forbidden to visit the court during the session of the assembly. Nestorius attends, accompanied by his friend Irenæus. Cyrill, with a large number of Egyptian bishops. His friend Memnon of Ephesus. Nestorius petitions for a guard	153—154
Detention of the Roman delegates, and of John patriarch of Antioch. The council opened in an illegal manner on the 22nd of June, 431, by Cyrill, supported by Memnon, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem, in spite of a letter from John of Antioch	155—156
The council, now the blind tool of Cyrill, send a summons to Nestorius. His protest. The fanatical speeches of Eupotius of Ptolemais and Rheginus of Constantia. Sentence of deposition passed on Nestorius, which is publicly announced, and reported to the emperor.	156—159
Letter of Nestorius and ten other bishops to the emperor, describing Cyrill's arbitrary proceedings, and demanding assembly legally conducted	160
Candidian suspected by the Cyrillian party	160
Arrival of John. Meeting of a separate council—by which Cyrill and Memnon are deposed, and Cyrill's anathemas condemned. The other bishops invited to a common council.	161—162
Arrival of the Roman legates, who unite with the party of Cyrill. John summoned by this party-council. He and his associates suspended	162—163
Impartial letter of the emperor to the synod; answer of the Cyrillian party	163
Dalmatius the Archimandrite, gained over and excited by Cyrill, heads a large procession of monks and of the people to the emperor's palace. In consequence of this, three Cyrillian bishops allowed to visit Constantinople	164—166
Letter of Nestorius to his former friend and patron, the chamberlain Scholasticus	166
Irenæus gives an account to the emperor of the arbitrary conduct of Cyrill; yet John, the Syncel of Cyrill, produces a partial impression in his favour	167
The Comes John appointed the emperor's commissioner to the council. Nestorius, and also Cyrill and Memnon, are to be deposed. Indignation of the Cyrillian party. The Comes invites the emperor to call before him eight bishops from each of the parties	168—170
Nestorius retires to a cloister	170
The eight delegates from each party appear before the well-meaning but weak emperor	170—171
Cyrill's briberies at the court. The emperor prejudiced against Nestorius by the influence of Pulcheria. The Orientals petition for a dismissal of the council. Nesto-	

	Page
rius remains deposed. Cyrill and Memnon return to their bishoprics. The emperor still hopes for the restoration of peace between the two parties	171—172
<i>Compact between Cyrill and the Orientals, A.D. 432, and its consequences, 173.</i>	
Cyrill subscribes the creed proposed by John of Antioch. John consents to the condemnation of Nestorius. Maximian appointed patriarch of Alexandria	174—175
New divisions. Cyrill accused by the zealots of his own party. Compact disproved on the part of the Antiochians. The more moderate, such as Theodoret, dissatisfied with the removal of Nestorius and the condemnation of his doctrines. The zealots, such as Alexander of Hierapolis, and Meletius of Mopsuestia, demand the condemnation of Cyrill's anathemas, and regard him as an excommunicated person. Excited by the violent conduct of John of Antioch, they form an opposition party in the East, the synod of Cilicia Secunda	175—181
Proclus appointed patriarch on the death of Maximian, in 433, although the people demand Nestorius. His connexion with Cyrill and John. The latter endeavours to put down the opposition of the Asiatics by resorting to the civil power	182—183
Theodoret's negotiations with John. He endeavours to bring over the more rigid Antiochians, but fails. Alexander of Hierapolis and Meletius of Mopsuestia banished	183—187
<i>Sequel of the fate of Nestorius, 187.</i>	
Remains four years in a cloister near Antioch. A.D. 435, banished to the Egyptian Oasis. His letter to the præfect of Thebais, and the unmerciful treatment he received. His tragedy written by himself (and that of his friend Irenæus). Circumstances of his death unknown . . .	188—191
Severer laws passed against Nestorianism, A.D. 435. Theodoret, continuing steadfast, is accused of being a Nestorian by Cyrill	191—192
<i>Cyrill's plan to procure the condemnation of Diodorus and Theodore. His death, 192.</i>	
The attempts of Rabulus of Edessa, and of the abbot Maximus, violently opposed in the Syrian church	192—193
Cyrill's labours with the emperor frustrated by the superior prudence of Proclus. The latter's <i>Tomus ad Armenos</i> . His delegates transcend their powers. Letter of the Antiochian synod in behalf of Theodore, addressed to the emperor. Letter of Proclus to John, and ordinance of the emperor to the synod. Cyrill evades the storm . . .	193—195
Cyrill's work aimed against Theodoret: "that there is but one Christ." Theodoret's defence of Theodore	195—196
New plots of Cyrill. His death.	196
<i>Dioscorus, Cyrill's successor, of the same mind with his pre-</i>	

	Page
decessor, but still more violent—his zeal to establish the authority of the Alexandrian church. Treats every distinction of natures in the concrete subject as a Nestorian heresy. Theodoret the main object of his attack. His connection with Syrian monks and ecclesiastics under Barsumas, and the illiterate monks of Constantinople under Eutyches	198—200
The <i>Eranist</i> of Theodoret, a work temperately composed against the Eutychian and Egyptian type of doctrine, in 447	201—202
Theodoret arraigned by Dioscurus before Domnus of Antioch. Mild letter of Theodoret to Dioscurus. Theodoret accused by Dioscurus before the emperor, of Nestorianism. Theodoret and Domnus defend themselves. Theodoret forbidden to leave his diocese	202—203
<i>Eutyches and the Synod at Constantinople, in 448, 204.</i>	
Complaint entered before this synod against Eutyches by Eusebius of Doryleum. Flavian, president of the synod, attempts to reconcile the parties, but fails. Eutyches appears before the synod, after being thrice summoned. Emperor's letter to the synod, apparently in favour of Eutyches. Florentius, the emperor's commissioner of faith	204—206
Eutyches deposed and excommunicated	208
Influent connections of Eutyches. His petition to the emperor. Sentence revised—but confirmed	208—209
Eutyches appeals to a general council, and confers for this purpose with Leo the Great of Rome. Flavian seeks to hinder this, and writes also to Leo	210—211
<i>Robber's Synod at Ephesus, A.D. 449, 211.</i>	
Party ordinance of the emperor. Dioscurus president of the synod. Orders respecting Theodoret and Barsumas. Commissioners of the emperor	211—213
Dioscurus rules supreme, by means of his voice, the monks, the soldiers, and the cowardice of many bishops. The Niceno-Ephesian creed established as alone valid. Flavian, Eusebius, Domnus, and the firm Theodoret deposed	213—217
<i>Course taken by Leo the Great with regard to the Robber's Synod, 218.</i>	
Acquiesces in the condemnation of Eutyches. His letter to Flavian. Slight attention paid to his delegates at the Ephesian council. Flavian and Theodoret appeal to an Italian council.	218—220
Leo's letter, at first to no purpose, against the <i>latrocinium</i> . Negotiations with him, to procure his recognition of Anatolius	220
Change of political relations. Pulcheria and Marcian in power, after 450. Leo's influence increases	221—222

	Page
Order for a general council to meet at Nice. Leo's delegates.	
Council removed to Chalcedon	223
<i>Fourth ecumenical council, held at Chalcedon, A.D. 451, 223.</i>	
Excitement of the parties. Theodoret's reception. Many bishops veer round with the new breeze at court	224—225
Aversion to the forming of a new creed. The creed of Anatolius, which is approved by the Egyptian party (Christ out of two natures). A part of the Orientals and the Roman delegates not satisfied. Threat of a Western council. A creed finally agreed upon, by adopting several articles from the letter of Leo	226—228
Dioscurus deposed	229
Unworthy treatment of Theodoret, who at last directly condemns Nestorius	229—230
Case of the ten Egyptian bishops	231
The union at Chalcedon also, merely in appearance	231

Monophysite controversy, 232.

Original germ of it	232
The monk Theodosius, after the expulsion of Juvenal, made patriarch of Jerusalem	232
Proterius, the successor of Dioscurus at Alexandria, and the Monophysite party under Timothy Ailurus. Made bishop by this party in 457	233
Assassination of Proterius. The emperor desires an agreement of the two parties. Leo the Great applied to, and shows no disposition to yield anything. Imperial request addressed to all the Metropolitans. Wise judgment of the bishops of Pamphylia. Banishment of Ailurus, A.D. 460. The mild Salophaiciolus made patriarch	233—234
Basiliscus dethrones Zeno, A.D. 476. In the beginning favourable to Monophysitism. His circular letter condemns the Chalcedonian creed and Leo's epistle. Ailurus once more patriarch. Acacius of Constantinople resists the emperor. Anti-circular of Basiliscus	234—235
Zeno again emperor. Favourable to the Chalcedonian party. Choice of Peter Mongus by the Monophysites, after the death of Ailurus. Obligated to flee. Salophaiciolus again patriarch. Peter Mongus and John Talaya chosen	235—237
John Talaya, with Gennadius, at Constantinople. His connection with Illus. Irritates Acacius. The cunning Peter Mongus. <i>Zeno's Henoticon</i> , A.D. 482. New divisions. Four parties (the Acephali among the Monophys.)—Schism betwixt the Eastern and the Western church	237—239
Anastasius emperor in 491. Endeavours to maintain the Henoticon. Is suspicious of Monophysitism. The patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius of Constantinople. Philoxenus of Hierapolis and Severus, the two heads of	

	Page
the hitherto headless party (the Acephali). Tumult in Constantinople, in consequence of the addition to the <i>Trisagion</i> . The emperor removes Macedonius, but is afterwards obliged to make concessions to the Chalcedonian party	239—241
Justin emperor from the year 518. Enthusiasm for the Chalcedonian council. Vitalian and Justinian. Negotiations with Rome. Anathema on the leaders of the Monophysites. Acacius himself sacrificed. Severus flees to Alexandria	242—244
<i>Justinian emperor from the year 527, 244.</i>	
Would fain be champion of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy, and lawgiver to the church as well as to the state. In so doing, acts as the tool of others, particularly of his Monophysite wife Theodora. Anthimus her favourite, whom, deceiving her husband, she makes patriarch, A.D. 535. Anthimus excommunicated by Agapetus of Rome. Deposed by the undeceived emperor. Mennas is made patriarch	244—246
The council under Mennas, A.D. 536, fully condemns Monophysitism. Justinian's despotic law confirming this decision	246
Intrigues of Theodora, with the aid of Vigilius, a deacon, and after the banishment of Silverius, in 538, bishop of Rome. Vigilius declines to declare openly in favour of Monophysitism	246—248
The Origenistic court-party, led by Domitian and Theodore Ascidas. Peter of Jerusalem, Pelagius the Roman Apocrisarius, and Mennas (the two last being jealous of the influence of Theodore Ascidas), propose to the emperor the condemnation of the heresies of Origen. Emperor's letter to Mennas, and a synod condemn Origen; yet Theodore Ascidas and Domitian sacrifice the truth to party interests, and subscribe	248—251
The Origenists exert themselves to make the anathema pronounced on Origen recoil on Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas, for the purpose of drawing off the emperor, annoying Mennas, and forming a combination with the Monophysites and Theodora. They persuade the emperor to condemn those three church teachers by his edict <i>de tribus capitulis</i> , A.D. 544; which the four Oriental patriarchs, and the majority of the bishops, after some resistance at first, subscribe	251—255
<i>The controversy on the three chapters, 255.</i>	
Protest of the more free-spirited Africans, particularly of Pontian, as also of the bishops of Dalmatia and Illyria, against the imperial edict. At the request of Vigilius bishop of Rome, whom the emperor endeavours to gain,	

	Page
Fulgentius Ferrandus writes his judgment. (1. Authority of general councils. 2. Persons deceased are removed from the jurisdiction of a human tribunal. 3. The writing of an individual, though subscribed by many, does not approach to the authority of holy writ.) Vigilius, inclined to follow this judgment at first, is gained over by the court-party—then seeks himself to gain over the African bishops. Seventy subscribe his <i>judicatum</i> , but two of his own deacons, and others of the clergy, oppose it	255—257
Thorough and free-spirited defence of the three articles by Facundus of Hermiana	259
Vigilius, excommunicated by a Western synodal decision, urges the call of a general council. Retracts his <i>judicatum</i> . His shameful oath. Council of Constance, A.D. 551. A part of the African bishops appear. Persecution of the resisting bishops. (Reparatus of Carthage banished.)	261—262
New edict of the emperor drawn out in detail. Vigilius declines subscribing it	263
Fifth ecumenical council at Constantinople A.D. 553. <i>Vigilius Constitutum ad imperatorem</i> . Vigilius excommunicated by the emperor. Theodore of Mopsuestia, and several of the works of Theodoret and of Ibas, condemned. Many bishops deposed. Vigilius, still inconstant, confirms the decrees of the council	264—266
Union of the Monophysites with the ruling church not yet effected. Secession of the churches of Istria and Aquilia from Rome	266
Aphthartodocetism (Christ subjected himself to the affections and defects of a sensuous nature only <i>κατ' οὐκονομίαν</i>) proceeding from a mistaken effort to glorify Christ. The emperor, who had already, in 533, confirmed the formulas of the Theopaschites, makes it a law. Deposes Eutychius. Justinian's death, A.D. 565, delivers the church from the utter confusion which threatened it	267—268

APPENDIX.

FORMATION OF ISOLATED CHURCH PARTIES, WHICH GREW OUT OF THESE DISPUTES BEYOND THE LIMITS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE	268
<i>Nestorians in Persia.</i>	

Edessa in Mesopotamia, a seminary for Persian church-teachers. Rabulas of Edessa becomes a follower of Cyrill. Zealous against Nestorianism. Expels the Presbyter Ibas and others, who go to Persia. Letter of Ibas to Maris, and his translations of the writings of Theodore and Dio-

	Page
dorus into the Syrian tongue. A.D. 435 becomes bishop of-Edessa	269--270
Activity of Barsumas (one of those who had been driven away by Rabulas) as bishop of Nisibis, from 435 to 489, in establishing the Nestorian church; the organization of which is completed by a synod under Babias patriarch of Seleucia, from the year 496. (Permits the clergy to marry.)	270
The school of Edessa, destroyed in 489 by Zeno, transplanted to Nisibis	271
<i>Monophysites, 271.</i>	
In Egypt (seceded in the time of Justinian) and in Ethiopia	271
In Armenia, more liberal. The synod of Thiven, under the Catholicus Nierses, in 536, condemns the Chalcedonian council	271--272
In Syria, the restless activity of Jacob, the Metropolitan, in behalf of the oppressed church, till 578. Jacobites	272
Divisions among the Monophysites. The party of Severus. Niobites. Severus favours Phthartodocetism. Themistius inclined to Agnoëtism	273
Studies, for the most part, barren and unprofitable dialectics. Aristotle. Two men of larger views. John Philoponus (distinguished the two-fold Aristotelian sense of the term <i>φύσις</i> —accused of tritheism) and Stephen Gobarus (collates the opposite decisions of the older church teachers)	273--275
Mystical tendency of Bar Sudaili, an abbot of Edessa; taught that all fallen beings would eventually be raised to union with God. His Chiliasm. His mystical interpretations of scripture	275--278
<i>Doctrine concerning Man, 278.</i>	
Introductory remarks. Practical spirit of the Western church. The West (Tertullian) gives more prominence to sin and grace. The Oriental church (Origen) to that which is akin to God and to the free-will; answering to the two main directions of human culture	278--280
<i>The West, 280.</i>	
Development of the doctrine concerning man, previous to the time of Augustin	280
<i>The still undeveloped system of Hilary of Poitiers.</i>	
The sinful propensity cleaving to all men from Adam. Hilary seems to refer moral evil to the sensuous nature. All men need the forgiveness of sin. Among men, all goodness relative. Holds to a certain painful righteousness of the law. The mild yoke of Christ. Presupposes, too, the communication of a new principle of life by Christ. Gives prominence to the free-will	280--285

	Page
<i>Ambrose, the predecessor of Augustin</i>	285
Distinctly sets forth the fact of universal sinfulness (by men's own fault), and the doctrine of grace as the efficient cause of all conversion, which, however, is conditioned on human reciprocity	285—287
The two passages treating of grace as effecting the whole work	287

Anthropology of Augustin and Pelagius, 288.

Augustin, 288.

<i>Connexion of his scheme of doctrine with the history of his life.</i>	
Study of St. Paul, at the time of his conversion. The two great divisions of his life. The question, "whence is evil in man's nature, which is attracted towards goodness," led him to Manichæism; but became, also, the centre afterwards of his consistent scheme of thought	288—289
<i>The first period, reaching to about 394.</i> Certain Platonic ideas. His doctrine of moral corruption not derived from Manichæism. Moral evil the <i>μὴ ὄν</i> . Holds fast to free-will. His exposition of Rom. ix., of the year 394 (<i>Quod credimus, nostrum est</i>). The <i>occultissima animarum merita</i>	289—295
With more profound views of the nature of faith, he comes to give a more partial prominence to the divine agency. A predestination conditioned on foreknowledge does not satisfy his discriminating mind	295—296
<i>Second period.</i> The letter to Simplician, A.D. 397, also on Rom. ix. The incomprehensible, yet at all times just, councils of God	296—298
Augustin's scheme of doctrine distinctly struck out previous to the Pelagian controversy; before the system of Pelagius (which grew out of several views already prevailing in the church) had been formed out in opposition to Augustin	298

Pelagius, 299.

Monk of Britain. Connection with the East. His sequestered life in study and asceticism. Sense of moral power. His letter to Demetrius. <i>Præcepta et concilia</i> —against Jovinian. Takes the sermon on the mount in the literal sense	299—304
His practical interest in opposing the worldly Christianity of the times. Outward participation in the sacraments and faith (understood by him as an outward thing) are not enough. Opposed to purgatory; in favour of the eternity of future punishment. His opposition to moral inaction	304—306
His doctrine concerning man. Virtues of the pagans. Denies inherited depravity. The possibility of moral evil a necessary condition of goodness. Free-will overcomes the enticements of sense, or yields to them.	306—307
His doctrine concerning the Saviour that of the church, modified, however, by his doctrine of man. Works must be	

	Page
added to faith. Opposition to the Augustinian maxim : Da, quod jubes, et jube, quod vis.	307—308
His commentary on Paul's epistles, composed at Rome (re-written by Cassiodore)	308
<i>External history of the Pelagian disputes, 303.</i>	
Cœlestius, formerly an advocate, openly appears as a defender of the principles of Pelagius	308—309
Cœlestius visits Carthage (with Pelagius) in 411. Endeavours to obtain there the place of a presbyter. Complained of by Paulinus before a synod of that country, A.D. 412 (for maintaining that Adam's sin injured no one but himself). Cœlestius of the opinion that the subject in hand was a speculative question <i>de traducere peccati</i> ; but is excommunicated	310—311
<i>Pelagius at Palestine, A.D. 415.</i> Jérôme and Paul Orosius, his antagonists. Jérôme's letter to Ctesiphon, and his dialogues. Yet the Oriental church, on the whole, more favourably inclined to Pelagius than to Augustin.	311—312
Orosius arraigns Pelagius before a synod under John of Jerusalem, A.D. 415. The prudent John will not allow himself to be moved by the authority of Augustin. Pelagius vindicates himself before the Orientals on the charge that "he taught man might easily fulfil the divine commands." The complainants allege that the matter belonged to the West—and for this reason, John reports it to Innocent of Rome	312—314
Heros of Arles, and Lazarus of Aix, enter a complaint against Pelagius, before a synod held at Diospolis, under Eulogius of Cæsarea. Pelagius defends himself against the charge that he taught "there was such a thing as perfect purity and exemption from sin." Also condemns certain positions of Cœlestius, and is recognised as a member of the Catholic church	314—316
Alleged violence at Bethlehem. Jérôme and Augustin (de gestis Pelagii) concerning the synod of Diospolis	316
The three letters of the North African bishops, A.D. 416. Letter of Pelagius, and his vague confession of faith, all addressed to Innocent. Innocent, though not wholly given to the views of Augustin, joins in the condemnation of the Pelagian doctrines, but dies in the same year, 416	317—320
Zosimus, his successor, more favourable to the Pelagian doctrines. Cœlestius at Rome. His confession of faith, likewise vague and indefinite, satisfies Zosimus. Two letters of the latter to the Africans, asserting the orthodoxy of Cœlestius and Pelagius	320—322
The decided protest of a synod at Carthage produces an impression on Zosimus. He suspends his decision. Nine canons of the Africans against Pelagius	323—324

	Page
Africans secure on their side the civil power. Imperial edicts against Pelagianism. Zosimus thereby brought round. Cites Cælestius, who does not appear. Condemns by his "tractoria" Pelagius and Cælestius. Accused by the Pelagians of denying his own convictions	324—326
Bishops deposed for refusing to subscribe the <i>tractoria</i> of Zosimus	326
<i>Julian of Eclanum, 327.</i>	
More systematic, at the same time more passionate, than Pelagius and Cælestius. Free-spirited, well educated, moral, and devout. His remarks against the timid bishops. Against the interference of the civil power. Constantly makes his appeal to reason (<i>ratio</i>)	327—330
The Pelagian anthropology, rigidly carried out, must needs introduce a change, also, in the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. Leporius condemned as a Pelagian, A.D. 426. His recantation at Carthage, in which, however, there is no trace of his earlier Pelagian views, but only of his Antiochian notions respecting the person of Christ	331—333
Amianus, deacon at Celeba, a zealous and constant Pelagian. Translator of Chrysostom's homilies	333—334
Leo the Great opposed to Pelagianism. The Pelagian Seneca, about the year 500—letter of Gelasius of Rome against him	334—335
Final result of the controversy. Pelagianism suppressed by outward force—but as the victorious doctrine (not, however, the whole doctrine of Augustin) had in its favour the voice of the Christian consciousness at large, no reactions like those in the Oriental church ensued	335—336
<i>Inner relation to each other of the conflicting modes of thinking, and shape of the dispute, 336.</i>	
Importance of the questions in dispute depreciated by Pelagius and Cælestius—strongly asserted by Julian and Augustin	336—337
Fundamental difference. According to the professions of the parties: the different views of man's moral condition in relation to the first sin	338—339
A good deal that cannot be traced back to this point. The different way of apprehending the doctrine of man's free-will. Finding nowhere substantial freedom, Augustin is led to the supposition of a corruption of man's nature, and of a preceding original moral state. Pelagius, with his formal conception of freedom, conceives the possibility of goodness, as well as of moral evil—and his theory of an original moral state and of a first sin stands disconnected from his system. The <i>possibilitas utriusque</i> of Pelagius. The antithesis of "nature" and "grace" of Augustin, the dependence of all rational beings on grace for attaining to their destination.	339—344

	Page
Accordingly, the fundamental difference is in the different mode of apprehending <i>the relation of the natural to the supernatural</i> —or, reduced back still further, of <i>the creation to the Creator</i>	344
<i>Individual points of dispute, 344.</i>	
<i>The first sin and its consequences.</i> The Pelagians represent the first sin as the disobedience of a heedless child, yielding to the seductions of sense. Augustin makes the exceeding guilt of the first sin to consist in man's transgressing the law of God with a free-will, "concupiscence" the root of selfishness. Augustin's <i>propagatio reatus et pœnæ</i> , Rom. v. 12. The Pelagians taught that Adam injured his posterity only by his example. Augustin's well-weighed expressions respecting the <i>propagatio fidei per traducem</i> , which Pelagius called nonsensical. The Pelagians affirmed a progressive deterioration of humanity—yet that there were examples of perfect holiness . . .	346—353
The wavering notion of "grace" among the Pelagians, and their three stages of righteousness	354
Julian against the charge of the self-sufficiency of human reason—yet holds there is no contradiction betwixt reason and revelation	356
<i>Grace and free-will.</i> The Pelagians: all operations of grace conditioned on the bent of the will. According to Augustin, grace excludes all merit. To the Pelagians, grace consisted of outward revelations—to Augustin, of inward communications	357—359
<i>Doctrine concerning Christ as Redeemer.</i> The Pelagians, limiting the negative significance of the redemption, make it to consist especially in the ennobling of the imperfect human nature; Christ, the divine teacher, the highest pattern of the divine righteousness, imparted to man many new motives to moral effort	359—362
The Pelagians, recognising the objective significance of justification, place the <i>inner union with Christ</i> in the background	362
<i>Progressive development of the divine life according to Augustin, 363.</i>	
In opposition to the three stages of righteousness according to Pelagius, Augustin teaches there is but one only spring of true holiness—the specific principle of the Christian life. Augustin's narrow judgment of the pagan times (Rom. xiv. 23). On the other side, Julian's illogical distinction of the <i>fructuose</i> and <i>steriliter bona</i>	362—368
Augustin's <i>prevenient, efficacious, and cooperating grace</i> , and his "gift of perseverance"	369—370

Doctrine of Absolute predestination, 370.

	Page
Necessarily connected with Augustin's doctrine concerning grace. His more profound apprehension of freedom as a state leads him to deny it as a faculty. Contents himself with an apparent freedom. Real freedom only in the case of Adam	370—372
Augustin's prudent, logically skilful statement of this doctrine. Mischievous consequences derived from it already in 426, by the monks at Aduarnum. Against these Augustin writes his works de gratia et libero arbitrio, and de correptione et gratia	372—373

SEMI-PELAGIANISM AND AUGUSTINIANISM, 375.

*Intermediate Tendencies.**John Cassian, 375.*

●A monk from the East. His predominant practical bent. A disciple of Chrysostom	375
Recognises a universal corruption—also Augustin's views of "grace" and "justification," but in connection with a love of God extending to all, and with the exclusion of all constraining influence on the free will. His thirteenth collation, on the relation of grace and free-will	376—379
The Semi-Pelagians in Gaul not satisfied with Augustin's book de correptione et gratia. Some of the clergy there, however, enthusiastically attached to Augustin—for example, Prosper of Aquitania. His and Hilary's letter to Augustin, on the agitated state of men's minds	379—381
Augustin's works, written with Christian moderation, against the Semi-Pelagians. De prædestinatione sanctorum and de dono perseverantiæ	381—383
Prosper's hearty and fervent carmen de ingratis—in which, however, he omits to notice, in his opponents, the interest for a morality that would be free	383—384
Augustin's last years. His retractationes. The opus imperfectum. His letter to Boniface. Dies A.D. 429	384
Prosper and Hilary have recourse to Cœlestin of Rome. Cœlestin's indefinite letter to the Gallic bishops. The Com-munitorium of Vincentius—partly in opposition to the too great authority ascribed to Augustin	385—387
Hilary and Prosper in Rome. Prosper's unsuccessful efforts also with Sixtus	387—389
Writings of Prosper. Able exposition of the doctrine of predestination. God not arbitrary, but his judgments unsearchable. Germ of the distinction between the revealed and the secret will of God	389—391
The book De vocatione omnium gentium—[its author]—aims	

	Page
at a comparison resulting in favour of the Augustinian system of doctrine. His dialectic method	391—399
The three positions of man: <i>Voluntas sensualis, animalis, spiritalis</i> ; and the two kinds of grace, general and special. Our knowledge is but in part	393—395
<i>The Predestinians.</i> The "second book of the <i>Predestinatus</i> " (stern form of the doctrine of predestination, examples of Judas and Paul. Through Christ, a restoration of corrupt nature only in hope)	395—397
The author of the " <i>Predestinatus</i> ," a Semi-Pelagian. By prevenient grace, he understands only the work which Christ, accomplished here on the earth. Refutation of the above-mentioned examples	397—399
Genuineness of the second book of the <i>Prædestinatus</i>	400
The Semi-Pelagian Faustus of Rhegium. His practical Christian spirit. His controversy with the Predestination Laucidus. Council of Arles, A.D. 475. His book <i>De gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio</i> . Free-will not lost, but weakened. Distinguishes also a universal and a special grace; but this sometimes precedes human efforts. His well-conceived collation of the doctrines concerning man and concerning Christ. Mentions Augustin with respect. Gennadius on Augustin	401—404
Cæsarius of Arles, a man distinguished for practical activity, and Fulgentius of Ruspe (both driven out of Africa by the Vandals), and others of a similar stamp, bring about the triumph of the Augustinian system of doctrine	405
<i>Controversies occasioned by the work of Faustus.</i> The Scythian monks of Constantinople zealous for the orthodox faith. Question proposed by the African bishop Possessor to Hormisdas of Rome, and his free-spirited, moderate reply. Those monks, dissatisfied with the answer, are the occasion of Fulgentius of Ruspe writing several works against Semi-Pelagianism.	406—407
The council of Orange, A.D. 529, under Cæsarius, and that of Valence, testify to the victory of the Augustinian scheme of doctrine	407—408
<i>The Oriental Church, 403.</i>	
Slight participation of the East in the controversies of the West, relating to the doctrine concerning man	409
Theodore of Mopsuestia. His work against the system of Augustin. Whether at a later period he joined in the condemnation of Julian?	409—411
His anthropology: man the image of God for the whole creation, the bond of union to the entire universe. The necessary appearance of sin in the state of mutability. His views respecting the law, and respecting death. Exposition of Rom. viii. 19	411—416
His point of contact with Pelagianism. Weakness of man's	

	Page
nature, doctrine of freedom; difference. In Theodore's system, the doctrine of redemption occupies an essential place	416—417
<i>Chrysostom.</i> His practical spirit. His quiet development. His rich inward experience. His sphere of activity. His exposition of Rom. v. 19. Grace operates within, in proportion to the free determination of the will	417—420
Nestorius agrees essentially with Chrysostom. The occurrence with the four Pelagian bishops, and his letter to Cœlestine. Memorial of Marius Mercator. Nestorius' letter of condolence to Cœlestine. Pelagianism condemned by the Cyrillian council of Ephesus, out of complaisance to Rome	421—422
Isidore of Pelusium. Seeds of goodness left even after the fall. Grace needful for all is ordinarily not prevenient—is not constraining	423

Doctrine of the Sacraments, 423.

The notion of sacrament a very indefinite one. The ambiguous term <i>sacramentum</i> . Propensity to multiply holy symbols, especially in the Greek church	423—424
Greater doctrinal strictness of Augustin. The <i>virtus sacramenti</i> and the <i>sacramentum</i> . Outward symbols necessary for every religious society, but the determinate form God might alter in the New Testament. Necessity of a recipient state of mind. God's grace not absolutely connected with the symbol. He sets distinctly forth, in opposition to the Donatists, the objective significance of the sacraments. In the New Testament, the religion of the spirit, signs few and simple	425—426
Number of the sacraments still undetermined. The four sacraments of Augustin	427

Doctrine of Baptism, 428.

Connexion of baptism and regeneration. In connection with their different views of man, the Occidentals gave more prominence to the negative, the Orientals to the positive effect of baptism	428—430
Theodore of Mopsuestia. For adults, the forgiveness of sin and union with Christ; in the case of infant baptism, properly no forgiveness of sin, but communication of the higher life of exemption from sin (<i>anamartesia</i>). His nicer distinction of vehicle and efficient principle	430—432
In like manner, the Pelagians, though without reference to their principles, following the church tradition, affirmed the necessity of baptism for persons of every age. Their <i>intermediate state</i> of unbaptized children	432—434
This intermediate state a doctrine also of Gregory Nazianzen. Augustin at first, Ambrose, Pelagius himself, undecided. Augustin opposed to it. Doctrine condemned by a council	

	Page
at Carthage, A.D. 418. In the case of the baptism of infants, the faith of the church, according to Augustin, represents that of the subject	434—435
<i>Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, 435.</i>	
The idea predominant of a spiritual and bodily union with Christ; most strongly, in Cyrill of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, Nilus	436
Not directly a transubstantiation. Theodoret on the relation of the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ	437
Gregory of Nyssa approaches the theory of transubstantiation; expresses clearly the wide-spread idea of a repetition of the incarnation of the Logos.	438
More spiritual views of Athanasius. Augustin. Gregory of Nyssa	439—442
Eusebius of Casarea seems, like Origen, to distinguish the sensible and the spiritual ordinance	442
<i>Doctrine concerning the Last Things, 442.</i>	
The doctrine of purgatory (ignis purgatorius). Its abuse. Pelagius against it. Augustin seeks to guard it against misconstruction	442—443
<i>The doctrine of everlasting punishment.</i> Often impugned from frivolous motives. Against which Chrysostom. Combated on deeper grounds of Christian interest by the Origenistic and Antiochian schools.	443—446
<i>Opposite spiritual tendencies in Theology, which grew out of the after working of the Origenistic disputes, 447.</i>	
Enthusiastic admirers of Origen, and blind zealots opposed to him in the East. Marcellus of Ancyra, an opponent of Origen, held that he was the father of Arianism. Commixture of Platonic ideas with Christianity. Didymus an Origenist. Chrestomathy from the works of Origen, by Basil and Gregory of Nazianz. Great influence of Origen on Gregory of Nyssa	447—449
The monks, especially in Egypt, in part for, and in part against Origen	449
<i>Epiphanius of Palestine.</i> Educated among the Egyptian monks. A.D. 367, bishop of Constantia. Well-read, but uncritical. His upright but narrow doctrinal spirit. Zealous opponent of Origen	450
<i>Jerome.</i> His merits as a promoter of biblical studies. His zeal for the gospel, coupled with great defects. Born at Stridon, about 430. Disciple of the grammarian Donatus, and of Apollinaris. Baptized at Rome when a young man. Retires to the desert of Chalcis in Syria. Study of the ancient authors. His dream and his oath. Learns the Hebrew. Becomes a presbyter. Goes, about the year 380, to Constantinople, to Gregory of Nazianz.	

	Page
Studies and translates Origen. In 382 at Rome. Secretary of Damasus. Has many friends and enemies. Exerts himself to promote the ascetic life. Goes to Bethlehem. Spiritual education of young men. Improvement of the Latin version of the Bible, and new translation of the Old Testament after the original	450—456
Rufinus and John of Jerusalem united with Jerome also in the study of Origen. Relations of the latter with Origen	456—457
Zeal of Western pilgrims against Origen leads Jerome, who was anxious to maintain his reputation for orthodoxy, to exercise more prudence in expressing his views of Origen	457—458
Epiphanius, A.D. 394, at Jerusalem, where he requires of John the condemnation of Origen—and at Bethlehem ordains Paullinianus. Controversy between Epiphanius and John. Jerome takes the side of Epiphanius. A.D. 396, Jerome and Rufinus are reconciled	458—459
Rufinus in 397 repairs to Rome. His translation, with modifications, of the work <i>Περὶ ἀρχῶν</i> . Pammachius and Oceanus. Jerome incensed with Rufinus. Rufinus justified by Siricius. Anastasius against Origen and Rufinus.	459—462
Theophilus of Alexandria. Connected with Origenistic monks. His presbyter Isidore—a man of no character	462—463
His Epiphany-programm, A.D. 399, against the Anthropomorphites. Exasperation of the Scetic monks. Theophilus pacifies them by dissimulation	463—464
The Origenistic monks of mount Nitria. Evagrius. The four tall brothers. Out of revenge to these and to Isidore, Theophilus unites with the Anthropomorphites. Jerome and Epiphanius, at various synods after 399, stigmatize Origen as a heretic, and persecute those monks, who take refuge with Chrysostom at Constantinople.	464—466
<i>John Chrysostom</i> . Born 347, at Antioch. His mother Anthusa. His early education. Study of the ancients. From 386, presbyter at Antioch, under Flavian. Eloquence. A.D. 397, bishop of Constantinople. Freedom of spirit, sequestration, austerity. Eutropius. His inconstant relations to Eudoxia	467—469
Arrival of the monks. Letter of Chrysostom to Theophilus. Latter's accusation of the monks. Petition of the monks to the empress. Theophilus cited to Constantinople	469—471
Theophilus, full of vengeance against Chrysostom, unites with his enemies and with Epiphanius. Council held under Epiphanius, A.D. 401, for the condemnation of Origen. Epiphanius comes, in 402, to Constantinople. Is perplexed as to the course he ought to pursue.	471—472
Theophilus enters into an understanding with Eudoxia against Chrysostom. Arrives at Constantinople in 403. Synod at the Oak. Chrysostom deposed and accused of high treason, and sent into exile, but is soon recalled. His sermon on John the Baptist, and second exile, to Cucusus. His	

	Page
lofty confidence of faith, and restless activity in spreading the gospel in his exile. Innocent of Rome intercedes for him. New exasperation of his enemies. Is conveyed to Pityus in Pontus. Dies on the journey, at Comanum, A.D. 407	473—477
Schism of the Johannites disposed of by Atticus and Proclus (438)	478
Synesius, despite his views (in part Origenistic) differing from those of the ruling church, is ordained by Theophilus bishop of Ptolemais	479—480
Individual ecclesiastics inclined to the views of Origen	480
Origenistic controversies in the time of Justinian. Justinian's edict, and council under Mennas, A.D. 541, against the Origenistic doctrines. Question, whether the fifth ecumenical council (433) condemned Origen?	481—482

APPENDIX TO HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

Sects, 483.

Significance of the sects	483
<i>Audians.</i> Audius in Mesopotamia. His opposition to the unspiritual clergy. Anthropomorphism. Excommunicated. Bishop of his sect. Time of the Easter festival. When old, banished to Scythia. Promotion of the ascetic life . . .	484—485
One-sided ethical tendencies. Rhetorius and the knowledge-haters (Gnosimachi)	485—487

Manichæans, 487.

Persecution in Persia, A.D. 525. Law of Diocletian against them. At first tolerated under Constantine, afterwards persecuted. Intercession of Libanius in their behalf. Laws against them after 372. Leo the Great inquires them out. Laws of Valentinian III. and of Justinian (punishing them with death). Persecuted in Africa by Hunerich (477)	487—490
Secret spread of the sect. Agapius. Faustus of Mileve. His writings against the church doctrines	490—491
New commixtures of Christianity with Oriental theosophy. The <i>Θεοσοφία</i> of Aristocritus	491

*Priscillianists, 492.**External history of the sect.*

In Spain. Marcus of Memphis. Priscillian: rich, respectable, eloquent, a rigid ascetic. The bishops Instantius and Salvianus his adherents. Hyginus of Cordova, and Idacius of Emerita, opposed to him. Synod at Saragossa, A.D. 380. Ithacius of Sossoba. Idacius and Ithacius resort to the secular arm. The Priscillianists have re-

	Page
course in vain to Damasus of Rome and Ambrose. Bribe Macedonius	492—493
The worldly-minded Ithacius gains over Maximus the usurper, against the Priscillianists. Synod at Bourdeaux, A.D. 384. Instantius deposed. Priscillian appeals to the emperor. Martin of Tours intercedes with the emperor, whom Magnus and Rufus once more bring round. Trial by Euodius. Priscillian executed. The Priscillianists persecuted. Theognist, Martin of Tours, Ambrose, opposed to these unspiritual proceedings. Enthusiasm of the oppressed:	493—497
. <i>Doctrines of Priscillian</i> , 497.	
Dualism and emanation system. The souls of men divine essences sent forth to contend with the empire of darkness. The souls confined in bodies by the powers of darkness; but in order to their own subjugation. The twelve sidereal and the twelve celestial powers. Man the microcosm. Man still subjected to the influence of the stars until the appearance of the Redeemer. Monarchian and Docetic notions of Christ. Regeneration. Use of the Old Testament and of several apocryphal writings	498—501
Morality of the Priscillianists. Rigidly ascetic. Pious fraud: "libra" of the later catholic bishop Dictinnus. The opponents of the Priscillianists employ their own arts against them: against which Augustin's work, <i>De mendacio ad consentium</i>	501—502
Propagation of the sect clandestinely. Council of Braga, A.D. 563. Important influence of the sects on the succeeding centuries	502
Index of subjects and names	503

CHURCH HISTORY.

SECTION FOURTH—*continued.*

HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY APPREHENDED AND DEVELOPED AS A SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES—*continued*

II. OPPOSITE WAYS OF APPREHENDING AND TREATING THE SINGLE GREAT DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.

●A. *Theology in the more limited sense of the term, or the Christian Doctrine concerning God.*

WE shall notice first the controversy which, in its result, had the greatest influence on the whole development of the doctrine concerning God, viz., the controversy on the doctrine of the *Trinity*, from which all the others may be most conveniently derived.

This controversy was a natural consequence of the opposite conceptions of the doctrine of the Trinity, which had been formed in the course of the preceding period; and its origin can be rightly understood and judged only by a previous consideration of the latter. Considering it in this connection, we can be under no temptation of ascribing too much importance here to external circumstances and occasions, or to the influence of any individual man, as, for instance, Arius. Neglecting this, we might easily be misled to pass an unjust judgment on Arius, after having unjustifiably removed him out of his connection with the dogmatic development of his times, so as to consider his system merely as *his own* work, and not as, in a certain sense, a product of the epoch of dogmatic development in which his life was destined to fall.

We observed, near the close of the preceding period, two main systems on the doctrine of the Trinity, and more particularly on the doctrine concerning the relation of the Son of God to the Father; the system, for the most part peculiar to

the Western church, in which the Christian *theistic* interest was most distinctly expressed; and the Oriental system of emanation and subordination, which obtained a settled form through the labours of Origen. By the former, the unity of essence (the *ὁμοούσιον*) in the Triad was made specially prominent, with a view to distinguish precisely the Son of God from all created beings, and to retain firmly the principle of *Monarchy*; while, on the other hand, the latter system had grown from the establishing, under more precise conceptions, of the older emanation theory—its aim being simply to remove from the latter all temporal and sensuous representations. This system, it is true, in one respect coincided with the other; namely, that it affirmed the difference not merely in degree, but in essence, betwixt the Son of God and all created beings: but the doctrine of the unity of essence was combated by this system as an annihilation of the distinction of persons; and this constitutes that opposition between the two systems which we remarked already at the close of the preceding period. But when, now the opposition to the former system was carried to a still further extreme, a third system was formed, which, along with the unity of essence, rejected also the eternal generation; and in general would not admit any essential difference between the conception, *Son of God*, and the conception of a created being—between the notion of a generation from God, and the notion of a creation. *This* system stood connected with the older subordination theory, and was in so far nothing new,* but only an attempt to fix and hold fast, in this doctrine, an earlier step of development, in opposition to any further progressive movement. The novelty consisted in the form in which the doctrine so fixed and held fast was understood, and in which it must assume a more rigidly distinctive and exclusive character. In the letter of Dionysius, bishop of Rome, to Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, we find already the indications of such a mode of apprehension (see vol. II., sect. 3, p. 335). Now it was this which, being fully expressed, in the beginning of the fourth century, by the presbyter Arius, evoked

* As, in fact, although the Logos was doubtless distinguished from other created beings, yet no scruples were felt at the same time to apply to him the phrase *ἐκτισμένος*, in Proverbs viii. 22; consequently, in so far, of applying to him the name of a *κτίσμα*.

the disputes of the rise and progress of which we are about to give an account. •

As to Arius, it should be remarked, with regard to his peculiar^{*} theological education, that he was a scholar of the presbyter Lucian of Antioch.* From this school he took that direction which led him to place the free, grammatical interpretation of the Bible at the basis of his doctrinal system. But in cases where this direction was not accompanied with a general intuition of biblical ideas vitalized by Christian experience, and this general intuition had not made plain the true relation of the particular to the general in the expressions of holy writ, it might tend, by laying too great stress on particulars, and giving them an undue prominence, to promote narrow views of the truths of faith. This was the case with Arius, in whom a tendency to narrow conceptions of the understanding, exclusive of the intuitive faculty, predominated. In the Antiochian school, too, he probably took a direction in opposition to the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, which led him to give particular prominence to the distinction of hypostases, and, what was connected therewith, to assume at the same time a polemical attitude against the Homoousion.† But, even in the system of Origen's school at Alexandria, he might afterwards find many points of concurrence with his own views, as well in the polemics against the doctrine of the unity of essence and in the subordination theory, as also in the way in which the doctrine of the freedom and self determination of all rational beings was here apprehended. Arius certainly did not believe that he was preaching a new doctrine, but only bringing out and establishing the old church subordination system;—without which it seemed to him neither the monarchical principle of the Triad, nor the self-subsistent personality of the Logos, could be maintained. “We must either suppose,” says Arius, “two divine original essences without beginning, and independent of each other; we must substitute a *Dyarchy* in place of the Monarchy; or we must not shrink from asserting that the Logos had a beginning of his existence, that there

* Which may be gathered from the circumstance that he addresses the bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia, in his letter preserved to us by Theodoret and Epiphanius, as *συλλογιστάς*.

† See vol. II. p. 333.

was a moment when he did not as yet exist" ($\eta\nu \alpha\rho\epsilon \omicron\upsilon\kappa \eta\nu$).^{*} The idea of a becoming without a beginning, a derivation in essence and not in time, was, to the feebly speculative, and feebly intuitive mind of Arius, something too subtle and refined,—something incomprehensible, self-contradictory. We perceive here how little suited Origen's method of intuition was to the mind of Arius. So, too, he supposed that, by a generation from God—inasmuch as particular stress was laid on this notion of a generation from God as distinguished from creation—nothing at all could be distinctly conceived, unless men were disposed to fall in with the sensuous, Gnostic representations of a partition of the divine essence.[†] But if men chose to lay particular stress on the notion, Son of God, and to employ this designation for the purpose of distinguishing the Logos from all created beings, they would in this way also fall into sensuous, anthropopathic notions. Between God the Creator and the creature, nothing else could be conceived as intervening. Either Christ was a divine, original essence, like the Father, and then it would be necessary to suppose two Gods; or else there should be no fear or hesitation in distinctly avowing that he was, like all other creatures of God, created, formed, begotten,—or however else it might be expressed; for, however it was expressed, the matter itself remained the same,—by his own will, as it pleased him, from nothing ($\epsilon\chi \omicron\upsilon\kappa \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$). Those passages in the New Testament in which he believed he found the expression $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$ employed with reference to Christ,[‡] in which he found him styled the *First-born*,§ consequently a beginning of existence, as he thought, ascribed to him, he could cite in favour of his theory. By all this, he intended by no means to lower the dignity of Christ; but would ascribe to him the greatest dignity which a being could have after God, without entirely annulling the distinction between that being and God. God created him, or begat him, with the intent through

* He intentionally avoided saying $\eta\nu \chi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\iota\omega\nu \delta\tau\epsilon$, for he unquestionably supposed that the Logos was produced by the Father before all time; the conceptions of time and of creation being, according to his opinion, inseparably connected.

† Here he might take sides with the school of Origen against a $\mu\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in $\tau\eta\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\beta\iota\alpha\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$, little as he could agree, according to the above remarks, with the spiritual way of apprehending the doctrine of emanation in the same school.

‡ Act. ap. ii. 36. Heb. iii. 2.

§ Col. i. 15.

him to produce all things else; the distance betwixt God and all other beings is too great to allow of the supposition that God could have produced them immediately. In the first place, therefore, when he determined to produce the entire creation, he begat a being who is as like to him in perfections as any creature can be, for the purpose of producing, by the instrumentality of this Being, the whole creation.* The names, Son of God, and Logos, were given to him in order to distinguish him from other created beings, inasmuch as although, like all created beings, he owed everything to the will and favour of the Creator, he yet enjoyed the nearest relationship to Him, inasmuch as the divine reason, wisdom, power, all which titles could only be transferred to Christ in an improper, metonymical sense, were yet manifested by him in the most perfect degree. As an example of the rude style of conception and expression in which Arius indulged, we may take the following remark of his: "Having determined to create us, God created a certain being whom he named Logos, Wisdom, and Son, in order to create us by him."† Arius quoted many examples of scripture phraseology, to show that the expressions Logos, power of God, are by no means always used in the holy scriptures in the same sense; so that it was in nowise necessary to understand by these terms a power and a reason of God inseparable from the Divine Essence; but they were oftentimes transferred and applied in an improper sense to other objects; as, for example, when even the locusts, Joel ii. 25 (according to the Alexandrian version), were called the great power of God.‡ Such explanations as these might, indeed, easily furnish occasion for representing Arius as a man whose main bent was to contend against the divine dignity of the Saviour,

* "Ὡς ἄρα θείων ὁ θεὸς τὴν γενετὴν κτίσαι φύσιν, ἐπειδὴ ἰσὺς μὴ δύναμιν αὐτὴν μιστᾶσθαι τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκράτου χείρας καὶ τῆς παρ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργίας, ποιῶ καὶ κτίζει πρῶτως μόνον ἵνα καὶ καλῶ τούτον υἱὸν καὶ λόγον, ἵνα τούτου μίσου γινομένου, οὕτως λόγον καὶ τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ γίνεσθαι δυνηθῇ. Athanas. orat. II., c. Arian. s. 24. Although Athanasius is here stating that in which Eusebius of Nicomedia, Asterius, and Arius agreed, and these very words consequently ought not to be ascribed to Arius, yet they are certainly altogether in accordance with his way of thinking.

† Athanas. c. Arian. I. s. 5. Agreeing precisely with the passage above cited: *Θελήσας ἡμᾶς δημιουργῆσαι, σποοῖσιν ἵνα τινὰ καὶ ὠνόμασιν αὐτὸν λόγον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ υἱόν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ δημιουργήσῃ.*

‡ See in Athanasius.

and to misrepresent him. But in reality this was meant by Arius only as a grammatical vindication of his own way of apprehending a biblical idea, where, certainly, it did not occur to him to suppose that from these examples, adduced to establish the scriptural use of language, anything should or could be inferred tending to the disparagement of our Saviour. But this grammatical interpretation must doubtless have appeared offensive to the prevailing *doctrinal* interest, which flowed out of a hearty Christian feeling. Arius perceived, beyond all question, that, from the very conception of a creature, an infinite distance must be inferred betwixt him and the Creator; nor did he shrink from expressing this. This, in fact, Origen had already expressed in affirming that as God is, in essence, infinitely exalted above all created beings, so, too, in essence he was infinitely exalted above the highest of created beings, the Son; and the latter, in essence, could not at all be compared with him.*

He reckoned as belonging to the essence of the rational creature—in this particular, falling in as well with the school of Origen as with that of Antioch—the *self-determining mutable free will*; the foundation of all the superiority enjoyed by rational beings. This principle he applied also, without concealment or evasion, to Christ. By his nature as a created being, Christ possessed a will subject to change; but he had constantly directed it to that only which is good, and by this means he had become *morally* unchangeable. Thus the Son of God, too, had obtained the glory which he possessed above all other creatures, not without the desert of his own will; for as God by his foreknowledge saw, from the beginning, what a holy life Christ would lead, as a man, in passing triumphantly through all his conflicts, he bestowed on him that glory, foreseeing that he would deserve it as the reward of his virtue.† Nor did he believe it possible to conceive of the

* Ἀλλότριος καὶ ἀνόμιος κατὰ πάντα τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς οὐσίας καὶ ἰδιότητος—ἀνόμιος ἢ ἄπειρον τῇ τε οὐσίᾳ καὶ δόξῃ. Athanas. Arian. I. s. 6.

† Τῇ μὲν φύσει ὥσπερ πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ λόγος ἔστι τριπλῆς τῷ δι' αὐτὴν ἀντιξουσίᾳ, ὥς βούλεται, μίνει καλὸς, ὅτι μίντοι θέλει, δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς τριπλῆς ὡν φύσεως. (Arius was led to push the matter thus far on account of the notions he entertained of the creature and of free will: for he set the changeableness of the free will over against a blind necessity of nature. The Arians proposed the dilemma, "Either the Son of God has a changeable free will by virtue of which he

Christ whom he found revealed in the New Testament in any other way than this. How conceive of his struggles and conflicts in the view of death, and of his prayer in these conflicts, without a changeableness of will? Had he been the almighty power of God himself, he would have had no fears for himself, but rather would have imparted strength to others. And, in the 2nd of Philippians, Paul does in fact represent his exaltation as being the reward of the obedience manifested in his life.* By simply distinguishing here between the human and the divine natures in Christ, Arius might, indeed, have been easily refuted; but this refutation could not have touched him according to the coherence of his own system: for here, too, he held fast to the, as yet rude, undeveloped doctrine of the first centuries, and trenched himself in what he supposed he found literally taught in the New Testament. Hence, following the older mode of apprehension, he considered the incarnation of the Logos to consist simply in his union with a human body;† and hence, too, all the actions and expressions of Christ denoting dependence on God, or limitation of any kind, as, for example, prayer and every manifestation of ignorance, could only appear to him as a proof of the correctness of his theory concerning the essence of the Son of God as a created being. If Christ was in essence the true and indwelling wisdom of the Father, how then could it be written that he grew in wisdom? (Luke ii. 52.) How could he ask where Lazarus had been laid, etc.?‡

Now, although such a conception of Christ did, indeed, contradict what is truly contained in the faith of Christ's divinity, still he did not hesitate to ascribe to him the name of God, which he believed he found clearly ascribed to him in the

may incline to moral evil or to moral good, or he is without will, like a block of wood or a stone." Athanas orat. c. Arian. I. s. 35.) Διὸ τοῦτο καὶ προγενώσκειν ὁ Θεὸς, ἵστας καλὸν αὐτον, παραλαβὼν αὐτῷ ταύτην τὴν δόξαν δίδωκεν, ὥν ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀρίτης ἰσχυὶ μετὰ ταῦτα· ὥστε ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὧν ᾤοντο ὁ Θεὸς, τοίουτον αὐτον νῦν γιγνῆναι, πιστοῖσι.

* Athanas. orat. III. 26; I. 42.

† We perceive here, also, the agreement and opposition between Arius and Origen. He coincided with the latter in considering the glorification of Christ the reward of his merit; but Origen referred this to Christ's human soul,—see vol. II. sect. 3. p. 376,—Arius to the Logos himself.

‡ Athanas. orat. III. 26.

New Testament,* and in the older confessions of faith. He was not conscious to himself of deviating from the older doctrines of the Eastern church; since in truth so much in the older church-teachers seemed to speak in favour of his opinion. Probably he appealed to those passages of scripture where the name of God seems to be applied in an improper sense to created beings, and thence argued that it was applied after an analogous manner, but in the highest sense to the Logos. Arius could not, consistently with his system, express himself otherwise than to say, that as Christ was all that which he was only by the grace of God, so by the communication of that grace he had obtained the divine titles and divine dignity, although in his essence he was not the true God.† He affirmed, with the other church-teachers, the incomprehensibility of the divine essence to all created beings; and, from his own point of view, he consistently applied this likewise to the Son of God, since, in placing him with created beings, he could not do otherwise. To Jesus, too, the essence of God was incomprehensible; and Christ knew him in a manner differing from the knowledge of other created beings only in degree, and according to the proportion of the higher powers bestowed on him by the Father.‡

All that we know about Arius would by no means persuade us to acknowledge in him a man fitted, by his superiority of intellect, to produce a new epoch in the evolution of doctrine. He himself was assuredly far from entertaining any such design. He was intending simply to defend the old doctrine of the church concerning the Trinity against Sabellian and Gnostic opinions, and to exhibit it in a consistent manner. He was in no wise conscious to himself of the result to which

* Since, at all events, he referred to him at least the passage concerning the Logos in the beginning of John's gospel.

† *Εἰ δὲ καὶ λίγισται θεός, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀληθινός ἐστιν, ἄλλα μετόχη χάριτος, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, οὕτω καὶ αὐτός, λίγισται ὀνόματι μόνον θεός.* L. c. I. s. 6.

‡ *Ὁ γινώσκων καὶ ὁ βλέπων ἀναλόγως τοῖς ἰδίῃς μέτροις, αἶδε καὶ βλέπει, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς γινώσκομεν κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν δύναμιν.* I. c. Arian. s. 6. The same is stated as a doctrine of Arius, by the Arian historian, Philostorgius, II. 3. According to the passage in Athanasius, Arius says, moreover: *Αὐτός ὁ υἱὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν οὐκ αἶδε.* Perhaps he taught that no created being could comprehend its own essence; and, remaining true to his principle, applied this also to the Son of God.

his tendency and his principles really led. It may justly be inferred, however, from the character of this system, and from the onward step of human nature, that, if Arianism had been able to gain the victory, men would not have rested content with the results which satisfied Arius, with such a half-way form of doctrinal opinions as could satisfy neither the demands of the understanding which aims to comprehend everything, nor those of Christian consciousness and feeling. This contracted, sober tendency of the understanding, would have gone on to express itself still further, and would have drawn down the transcendent doctrines of the gospel to another and an alien province.*

From what has been said, it may well be conceived that to him who had seized the doctrine of Christ's divinity in its true import and in its coherence with the entire system of Christian faith, the Arian doctrine must have appeared repugnant to the essence of Christianity, when he contemplated it from his own point of view; and hence there can be no mistaking the fact, that this controversy related to a matter of the greatest moment, both in a doctrinal and in a more general Christian point of view.

The Arius with whom these disputes began, was a presbyter of the Alexandrian church, and, according to the Alexandrian arrangements, presided over an independent parish church of this city, which went by the name of Baucalis. He had been placed here shortly before the presbyter Alexander had been made bishop of this city. Being a rigid ascetic,† he had probably great influence with his community, as this was a mode of life which there easily procured the highest respect.

Respecting the first outbreak of the controversy, there are different reports, which admit perhaps of being reconciled, if we consider that the first beginnings of such schisms, cherished as they may be in secret long before any public out-

* In the Arian doctrine concerning freedom may be found, in fact, already the germ of Pelagianism.

† In the old account of the Meletian schism, it is said of Arius: *Habitum portans pietatis*. See *Osservazioni letterarie Verona*, III. 1738, p. 16, i. e., he wore the pallium of the ascetics. With this agrees also the description of Epiphanius, when he says of him: "Ὦν κατῆφος τὸ εἶδος ἡμιφορίῳ ἐνδιδυσόμενος.

break, are capable of being stated and described in different ways according to different points of view. It is possible that Arius may have displayed his zeal, as a teacher of the faith, before he became a presbyter, and, in seeking to diffuse his own peculiar principles, have made himself friends and enemies.* When he proceeded to spread his opinions, under the new bishop Alexander of Alexandria, in his own parish church, he became involved in a controversy with other members of the clergy. Alexander, in the outset, took no part in it; he showed himself at the beginning undecided in his judgment, until finally, on the occasion of a theological conference, which the bishop of Alexandria was accustomed to hold at certain times with his clergy, he declared distinctly against Arius.†

The bishop Alexander, at an assembly of the clergy in Alexandria, and then at a more numerous synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops, composed of a hundred members, in the year 321, deposed Arius from his office, and excluded him from the communion of the church.

After Arius had been excommunicated, he wrote, in defence and for the propagation of his doctrines, a book called *Thalia*, probably a miscellany composed of pieces in poetry and prose from which we have already cited a few important fragments as illustrating the character of his system. He

* In the record above referred to, published by Maffei, it is said of Arius: *Et ipse doctoris desiderium habens.* His rupture with Peter, bishop of Alexandria, and his union with the Meletian party, had some connection perhaps already with doctrinal differences.

† Sozomen and Epiphanius relate, that the controversy arose in the first place independently of the bishop Alexander. According to the latter's account, several different parties had already been formed among the clergy and the laity, according as the latter attached themselves to one or the other of the parish presbyters; but many of these parties were lost again, while the more important antagonism betwixt Arius and the defenders of the Homousion became continually more distinctly prominent, and extended more widely. According to both the reports, the bishop Alexander had his attention first directed to the danger which threatened from other quarters; according to Sozomen, he at first appeared undecided. Socrates mentions the theological conference. There is also an allusion to this in the letter of the emperor Constantine to Alexander and Arius, cited by Eusebius, *de vita Constantini*, l. II. c. 69, when he says, that the bishop Alexander had asked all his presbyters how they understood a certain passage of scripture.

wrote also a collection of songs for *sailors, millers, and pilgrims*—an old expedient for spreading religious opinions among the people. For the rest it is quite probable, if we may judge from the fragments preserved, from the comparatively prosaic spirit of Arius, and the prosaic character of his doctrines, that in the apologetical work, and in the songs above mentioned, there was nothing poetical besides the mere form.

Alexander, moreover, sent circular letters to the more eminent bishops, in which he represented the doctrines of Arius as being altogether unchristian; and although he described these doctrines as they must have appeared to him from his own point of view, yet it cannot be said that he indulged himself in charging against them his own inferences. But Arius also sought, on his own part, to gain over to his side the suffrages of the more eminent bishops of the Eastern church; and this he could not have felt to be a very difficult task; for the majority of them, though not friendly to *his* own doctrines, were yet not any more favourably disposed to the doctrine of the Homoeousion, which Alexander maintained. They were inclined rather, for the most part, to the Origenistic system, which occupied the middle place between the two schisms—that system from which afterwards sprang the so-called Semi-Arianism: and in the opposition to the system of Alexander, Arius could find many a point of concurrence with his own doctrines, of which he would not be slow to avail himself. He affirmed that he took ground only against *those* heretical doctrines which attributed to the Son of God the same want of beginning as to the Father,* and which taught a sensuous emanation, a partition of the divine essence.† His doctrine, that the Son of God was produced ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, he explained in the sense in which it was, in fact, customary to understand this expression with reference to the doctrine of the creation out of nothing, viz., that by it was simply excluded the supposition of a pre-existing matter, or of an efflux out of the divine essence. The Son was produced by the will of the Father, before all time, as perfect God, only-begotten, unchangeable.‡ These explanations, of which, it

* Styled him *συναγεννήτας*.

† Οἱ τὸν υἱὸν λίγοντες, οἱ μὲν ἐκ γῆν, οἱ δὲ προβολήν.

‡ Consistently, indeed, Arius could not apply to Christ such an ex-

is true, it cannot be said that they contradicted the real doctrines of Arius, in which, however, it is impossible not to recognize the moderating influence of a respect to the ruling doctrine of the Eastern church,—these explanations were unquestionably suited to gain over the dominant party in his favour. Men of great influence in the Eastern church exerted themselves to bring about a compromise between Arius and his bishop—a compromise of this sort, that the bishop Alexander should allow Arius to retain his parochial office, without requiring that his views of the faith should agree in all respects with his own. Two individuals, in particular, sought, by their negotiations, to bring this about: Eusebius of Nicomedia, who as bishop of that city which, under the government of Dioclesian, had become the imperial residence for a main division of the East-Roman empire, possessed considerable influence, who was, moreover, an old friend of Arius, and still, more than many others, agreed with him in doctrine; and Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, who had acquired great reputation in the Eastern church as a learned and accomplished theologian.* The latter was, from the first,

pression as *πλήρης θεός*; but he might doubtless say this, according to the vague and indefinite manner in which he applied the name of God. The greatest difficulty he must have found, from his own point of view, in attributing to Christ the predicate of immutability; but here also the whole depended on the question,—how this was to be understood. He must have understood it as meaning, that Christ was immutable, not in his essence, but by virtue of the bent of his will as foreknown by God.

* The system of Eusebius—as it had already been matured previous to the commencement of the Arian controversies, and as he exhibits it in his work written before this time, the *demonstratio evangelica*—coincides entirely with that of Origen; and, from this circumstance, we may form a judgment of its relation to the Arian system. He was, with Origen, inclined to favour the theory of subordination—the notion of an *ἀπαυγάσμα τοῦ πρώτου φωτός*, of a *φῶς πρῶτον*, and a *φῶς δεύτερον*,—*οὐσία πρώτη* and *δύττερα*; to consider the Son as the perfect reflection of the original light, in the most perfect manner, like in all things to the Father, his most perfect image, revealing himself, *ἀφομοιωμένος τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα*; moreover, *ὁμοίος κατ' οὐσίαν*, as he is in fact the *εἶκον τῆς ἀγινότητος καὶ πρώτης οὐσίας*. See, for example, lib. IV. *præparat. evangel.* c. 3. Eusebius was of the opinion, that the Son of God could not be called absolutely eternal (*ἄπλως αἰδίδιος*), like the Father; that it was necessary to ascribe to him an origin of existence from the Father, since thus only was it possible to hold fast the doctrine of the monarchy; and that it was impossible to express the truth *after the manner of men*, in any other way than by saying the existence of the Father precedes the existence

disinclined to public dialectical disputes on divine things: he was anxious to avoid and suppress them; resembling in this respect another great church-teacher from the school of Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria. He dreaded, and not without good reason, the intrusion of profane passions into investigations on such matters, which, beyond all others, required, in order to any right understanding, the purity, calmness, and quiet of a soul consecrated to God. Holding the generation of the Son of God from the Father to be a subject which transcended the limited powers of all created minds, to say nothing of the human, the more unwise and mischievous did he consider disputes on such matters as these. Convinced that only a mind the most practised in thinking, and freed from the sphere of sensuous and temporal relations, could approximate to any worthy representation of a matter in its very essence incomprehensible, it seemed to him the more absurd and perverse to make such things a subject of dispute among men whose minds had not been trained to speculation, and even to introduce this controversy among uneducated laymen, who could understand nothing at all about such matters.

and the origin of the Son (*ὁ πατὴρ προυπάρχει τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ προϋφίστηναι*); but yet it was necessary here to remove away all relations of time. In a word, the idea of the origin of the Son of God was one which transcended the conceptions of all created beings, and of which none but the most acute intellect, abstracting from the relations of time and sense, could form any adequate representation (*ἐξυτάτη διανοία φαντάζεται υἱὸν γεννητὸν, οὐ χρόνοις μὲν τισὶν οὐκ ὄντα, ὕστερον δὲ ποτε γυγνόμενα, ἐξ αἰῶνος μάλλον δὲ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, ἀρρήτῳ καὶ ἀνεπιλογίστῳ ἡμῖν*). In that work, written before the time of the Arian controversies, he does not hesitate, it is true, to call the Son of God the *τίλειον δημιούργημα τοῦ τελείου*, and so consequently he could name him also the *κτίσμα τίλειον*; but, before the Arian controversies, men did not, in fact, as a general thing, distinguish so carefully, in the Eastern church, the doctrinal expressions employed on this point. But it may be gathered from the whole connection and train of ideas in Eusebius, that he made an essential distinction between the Son of God and created beings; and in the work de ecclesiastica theologia, written after the Arian controversies, he declared himself expressly as being against those who reckoned the Son of God among the *κτίσματα*; he taught that God was the *Father* of the Christ alone,—the God and Creator of all other beings; that the Son of God had come into existence in a way wholly different from that of all other beings (*οὐχ ὁμοίως τοῖς λοιποῖς γεννηταῖς ὑποσώντα*)—consequently that there was an essential difference between the notion of a Son of God and that of a created being. Ecclesiast. theol. l. i. c. 8.

He was more distinctly conscious, than others, of the limits fixed to the human knowledge of divine things, and of the distinction between speculative dogmatic explanations and the practical doctrines of faith. "What are we men," he argued, "who are unable to understand a thousand things that lie immediately at our feet? Who knows how the soul became united with the body, and how it leaves it? What is the essence of the angels, and the essence of our own soul? And why then, do we presume, when we see ourselves, even here, already surrounded, on all sides, by so many difficulties, to search after the perfect knowledge of the essence of the eternal Godhead? Why do we not rest satisfied with the testimony of the Father respecting his beloved Son: 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased—hear ye him!' But the latter tells us himself what we should know concerning him: 'God so loved the world, as to send his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.' We must believe on him, then, in order to be partakers of everlasting life. *For whosoever believes on him*, he says, hath eternal life; not *whosoever knows* how he was begotten of the Father. Were the latter the condition, none could obtain the promise; for the same Lord also declares, 'No man knoweth the Father except the Son, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father only.' Sufficient therefore for us, in order to salvation, is the faith which enables us to know the Almighty God as our Father, and to receive his only-begotten Son as our Saviour."*

But as it often happens with those who would wish to be moderate, that they forget their character whenever an immoderate zeal, however honestly meant, comes to oppose them in another; as it often happens in such cases even to *them*, that instead of placing themselves in their opponent's point of view, they judge him entirely from their own, and thus treat him with unfairness; so it turned out with Eusebius. It sometimes happened with him, that he could not appreciate the weight which a doctrinal difference must have had when regarded from some other point of view than his own; and that hence he allowed himself in the great error of passing unjust and censorious judgments on a zeal which, though inordinate, still proceeded from the deep consciousness of

* Ecclesiast, theol. l. I. c. 12.

such importance. Doubtless he was right in maintaining that faith in Jesus as a redeemer, and God as a Father, constitutes the Christian; but he could not transport himself to another man's point of view, to whom an error, which he accounted unessential, seemed to stand in entire contradiction with this faith. Hence he could be so far misled as to trace *everything* to passion, in cases where a purely Christian interest at bottom was not to be mistaken.

Eusebius of Cæsarea wrote a letter to the bishop Alexander, in which he sought to convince him that he was doing Arius injustice; and that if he would but rightly conceive him, he would find no difficulty in coming to an agreement with him.* Now Arius might well be inclined to accept of the proposed conditions of agreement, since being a subordinate pastor op-

* A fragment of this letter is to be found in the sixth act of the second Nicene council. Harduin. T. IV. f. 407. Arius, in his letter drawn up in common with certain other presbyters, which is to be found in Epiphanius, had called the Son of God a *κτίσμα* Θεοῦ τσλιόν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων. Now, with this explanation, the complaint urged by the bishop Alexander seemed to Eusebius to stand in contradiction; viz. that, according to Arius' doctrine, the Son of God had come into existence, ὡς ἐν τῶν κτισμάτων. But Alexander might rightly deem himself justified—regarding the matter from his own doctrinal point of view, and in the coherence of those explanations with the whole Arian scheme—in saying that he could find in those words nothing but the statement of a difference in degree between the Son of God and other created beings. He could conceive of nothing that could possibly intervene betwixt the conception Θεός and the conception κτίσμα; and, if the former of these predicates was not attributed to the Son of God in its strict sense, according to the idea of the unity of the divine essence, then nothing was, in his opinion, gained for Christian truth. Again, Alexander had objected to Arius that he taught ὁ ὢν τὸν οὐκ ὄντα ἐγενήσας; for Alexander considered in fact the being of the Son as grounded from eternity in the being of the Father, and derived from it according to the conception, not according to time. The attaining first from non-existence to existence belonged, according to his view, to the essential and distinctive mark of the κτίσμα. But, according to the Origenistic mode of apprehension on which Eusebius proceeded, God the Father was the ὢν absolutely (the ὢν of Plato). In so far as the existence of the Son was derived from the Father, it was necessary to conceive of him—although not in respect to his beginning in time, yet in reference to the absolute causality which was to be ascribed to the Father alone—as in the conception once not existing, οὐκ ὢν,—as having come into being by the causality of the Father, who alone is ἀπλῶς αἰδιος, or we must suppose two absolute causalities, two absolutely eternal beings, two ὄντες,—all which are identical expressions with Eusebius.

posed to the bishop, he could not but gain by any such compromise. Besides, from the very nature of the case, he who, in any doctrinal dispute, is chiefly contending, as Arius was, for a negative interest, can afford to be more tolerant than he can who is defending a positive interest. The negative and the positive, however, were in this case intimately connected; for Arius, in contending, as he supposed he was, against the deification of a creature, was defending, in his own opinion, the interests of pure theism—though in a way, to be sure, that savoured rather of a narrow Jewish spirit than of genuine Christianity; since, indeed, the idea of a God not self-included but self-revealing, and—without which the full revelation of God cannot be—*communicating himself*, is the fundamental idea of Christianity, and moreover the basis of all vital theism. It is often seen, too, that the negative interest, where it acquires dominion, is not less intolerant and inclined to persecution, but, on the contrary, even more so than the positive. Arius said, respecting the definitions of his opponents: “We could not even listen to these blasphemies, if the heretics threatened us with a thousand deaths.”* After such asseverations, we may well conceive that Arius, in case his doctrines could have gained the ascendancy, would not have been the most tolerant of men. But neither can we greatly censure the bishop Alexander—to whom the doctrines of Arius, regarded from his own point of view, must have appeared to undermine the very essence of Christianity—if he believed it incompatible with a conscientious discharge of his office, as a shepherd over the flock, to suffer that Arius who certainly, to judge from the above-cited avowal, and from his songs before alluded to, could not keep his peculiar system to himself in discharging his public duties as a teacher, and who was assuredly not wanting in a zeal for making proselytes—to suffer such a man to remain as pastor over his community.

When Constantine, in the year 324, after his victory over Licinius, had obtained the sovereignty over the entire Roman empire, and it became his favourite plan to unite all his subjects together in one worship of God, he must have been greatly annoyed to see so important a schism, which found many to take an active share in it, even among the laity, germinating within the church itself. He considered it in-

* Theodoret. I. 5.

cumbent on him therefore, at the very outset, to take every possible measure for removing it. To this end, in the year 324, he despatched the bishop Hosius of Cordova, who then stood high in his confidence and favour, to the bishop Alexander and to the presbyter Arius with a letter,* expressing his displeasure at the outbreak of this whole controversy, and calling upon them mutually to recognize each other as Christian brethren, without insisting, either of them, upon the other's adopting his own peculiar convictions. The party of Eusebius of Cæsarea must have succeeded, at that time, in bringing the emperor wholly over to their own views of this dispute; and to an emperor who looked upon the matter in its outward aspects, and to whom the preservation of quiet was the most important consideration, such views would be likely to appear the most plausible. Constantine represented the questions in dispute as being nothing but rash, speculative questions, standing in no connection whatever with the essence of Christianity. He found fault alike with those who had propounded and with those who had busied themselves in answering such questions. He expressed his special displeasure that such matters, which so few were capable of understanding, should be brought publicly before the people. He held up to them the example of the philosophers, who, even while differing on particular points of doctrine, could nevertheless reckon themselves as belonging to one and the same school. The doctrinal impartiality, or rather indifference, of the emperor, or the individual who wrote in his name, went, however, still further than even the moderation of a Eusebius would have approved, had he allowed himself to make clear to his own mind what was implied in the emperor's language; for the latter then made the essentials of Christianity, in which all should agree, to consist simply in the faith on a Providence.† Considered from this point of light, the matters to which this controversy related must indeed have appeared as in the highest degree insignificant;‡ but as a matter of course, a letter of this description could have no influence in bringing the contending parties any nearer together.

The attempt of the emperor Constantine in this way to re-

* To be found in Euseb. II. de vita Constantini, c. 64.

† Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς θείας προνοίας μία τις ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστω πίστις

‡ Ἐλαχίσταις ζητήσεσι.

store the peace of the church having failed, and the two controversies which broke out in Egypt at the same time, the Arian and the Meletian, having produced violent movements even among the laity, which threatened serious consequences of a political nature,* the emperor was forced to look round for some radical means of restoring quiet. As the bishops appeared to him to be the representatives of God and of Christ, the organs of the divine Spirit that enlightened and guided the church; as he had before him the established custom of deciding controversies in the single provinces by assemblies composed of all the provincial bishops, it would, according to this analogy, appear to him to be the most natural means of disposing of the present controversy, which had become so widely diffused, to convoke a council composed of all the bishops of his empire; and the employment of such a means seemed, in fact, to be required for the decision of another important matter connected with the religious interest in the mind of the emperor, viz, the bringing about of a general agreement as to the time of holding the Easter festival. He summoned, A.D. 325, a general council to meet at Nice, in Bithynia. It is stated that three hundred and eighteen bishops here came together, of whom by far the greater part were Orientals; and the emperor himself took an active part in the transactions on this occasion.†

* See Euseb. vit. Constantin. III. 4.

† As no complete collection of the transactions of this council has come down to us, the only means left for obtaining a knowledge of the true course of its proceedings is, to take the accounts given by those reporters of the different parties who were present at the deliberations, and form our conclusions from a comparison of them all. These were more particularly Athanasius and Eusebius of Cæsarea. Even if we could suppose that Athanasius, who only accompanied his bishop in the capacity of archdeacon, was in a situation to obtain as accurate a knowledge of the intrigues which influenced the course of the council, as the bishop Eusebius, who stood in such close connection with the court; yet it is important to remark, that in the case of Athanasius, there were many things which would render it difficult for him to take an unbiassed view of the proceedings. Regarding the council as the organ by which the divine truth expressed in the *ἐκμυστήριον* had obtained the victory over the Arian error, disposed to look upon the determinations of this council as simply expressing the consciousness of Christian truth, which then inspired the majority of the bishops, everything would naturally be suppressed by him which might cause the matter to be considered in an altogether different light, and exhibit the Nicene creed as an instrument

To form a correct notion of the order of business at this council, we must, in the first place, present clearly before our minds the relation of the parties who were present;—those who agreed entirely with the doctrine of Arius, which was but a small party;*—then the advocates of the Homousion, who likewise in the Eastern church composed but a comparatively small party;†—and finally those who occupied the

forced upon the majority of the council by the influence of the court-party, which governed the emperor. This holds good especially of the tract written by Athanasius in defence of the Nicene council. In the next place, as to his *Epistola ad Afros*, it is to be remarked, that although Athanasius reports in this letter many important circumstances relating to the internal history of the council, yet he distorts the true form of the facts, by persisting to recognize only two parties at the council,—avowed Arians, and adherents to the doctrine of the unity of essence. But that these two parties were not the only ones at the council, but, on the contrary, the party which held the middle ground • between these two must have been the dominant party there, may be easily gathered from looking at the situation of the Eastern church in this period, as well as from its whole course of development up to this time. But it was natural that Athanasius, looking at the matter from his own doctrinal position, would be inclined to take cognizance of but two parties, Arians and advocates of the Homousion. Between these there was for him no neutral ground; and hence, indeed, we may account for the fact, that he could reckon Eusebius of Cæsarea with the Arians. He comprised them all under one name, that of οἱ ἀρειῖ 'Ερεβίω (Eusebius of Nicomedia). Hence he could attribute what he ought to have transferred to two different parties, to one and the same party, and—inasmuch as he confounded the interests of two different parties—so represent the matter as if every opposition to the Arian opinions proceeded from those who favoured the Homousion. In respect to Eusebius, on the other hand, he speaks, in the pastoral letter which he sent from the council of Nice to his own community, of the influence of the emperor without concealment and without shame;—a fact which reflects no honour on himself or on those friends of his who allowed themselves to be, for the most part, governed by such influence. But he was too much of a court theologian, though belonging to the better class of this party to be conscious of the dishonour. If the majority at the council did in fact declare for the Homousion, in a way so entirely independent of foreign influence as Athanasius represents, the next following events in the Eastern church would be incapable of explanation. These testify more decidedly in favour of the correctness of the representation given by Eusebius, than of that given by Athanasius.

* So Athanasius, in the *Epistola ad Afros*, s. 5, justly calls the Arians at the council, τοὺς δεκούντας ὀλίγους.

† Which Athanasius, to be sure, nowhere intimates, since he makes all the opponents of strict Arianism advocates of the Homousion, and wholly overlooks the middle party.

middle ground between the two parties, and entertained similar views with those of Eusebius of Cæsarea, of whose system we have spoken above. From these last sprang up afterwards the party called Semi-Arians. It was the wish of these last, that the doctrine of Christ's divinity should be settled only in such general expressions as had hitherto satisfied the Christian want, so that, with regard to the difference which divided the two contending parties, nothing was to be defined, and each of the parties might be allowed to interpret the language according to its own meaning. Many of the decided expressions of Arius concerning the nature of the Son of God must, beyond question, have appeared offensive even to the dominant middle party at the council; and such expressions could easily be laid hold of, to represent him to the Orientals as an opponent of the old church doctrine of the Triad.* A condemnation of these Arian propositions might doubtless have been easily carried through, if, on the other side, the party defending the Homousion had not also raised an opposition to the dominant church doctrine of the East, and if certain individuals had not come out as mediators between the contending parties. Several bishops who belonged to that second (afterwards denominated the Semi-Arian) party zealously exerted themselves to establish peace, and to reduce to silence those who were earnestly opposed to the doctrines of Arius.† They endeavoured to show, that the expressions of Arius did not, at least, have any such offensive sense as they appeared to have on the first glance; and they proposed certain general formulas of agreement, with which both parties might be satisfied. The leaders of the Arian party, entering into these forms of agreement, declared themselves ready to retract the offensive expressions, and to adopt the doctrinal technology hitherto in use in the Eastern church, which in truth they

* Accordingly, that may be perfectly true which Athanasius, in the *Epistola ad episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ*, s. 13, says with regard to the general murmur of disapprobation with which the explanations of Arius were received, as well as what he says also in the *Epistola ad Afros*, s. 5, with regard to the agreement in the condemnation of the Arian dogmas, except that, owing to the confusion of parties already alluded to, he inferred too much from this circumstance.

† Eustathius of Antioch, as cited by Theodoret. I. 8. Ὁμοῦ τινὲς ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν συνήθημα προβαλλόμενοι τῆς ἐρήνης κατεσίγασαν μὴν ἁπάντας τοὺς ἐρίστα λόγων ἰαυότας.

could very well explain according to their own sense. . A prominent part was taken among the authors of peace, especially by the learned bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea. He laid before the council a confession of faith, containing the doctrine which, as he said, had been held forth from the first by the bishops in his church,—the confession which he had received in his earliest religious instruction and at his baptism, and which as a presbyter and a bishop he had constantly preached.* This creed distinctly expressed the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but in such expressions as, although, according to the full import of the conceptions thereby denoted, they stood in contradiction with the Arian tenets consistently understood, yet might be very well united with those tenets by Arius, without giving up his own point of view.*

This confession had the advantage of being composed, for the most part, of scriptural phraseology, which was considered by the party of Eusebius as being a peculiar merit. In the creed of Arius, as in the formula of the Homoousion, they especially censured the use of expressions not conformed to the language of scripture, but certainly not on altogether good grounds; for as the forms of expression employed by the scriptures have quite another purpose in view than the close definition of doctrinal conceptions, and as, moreover, new forms of error require to be met by new forms of doctrinal expression, so the scriptural phraseology cannot always be exactly the best adapted for the antithetic determination of a dogmatic conception, and the fact that the expressions employed are *not* to be met with in scripture cannot be considered as exactly a valid objection to their employment. The advocates of the Homoousion might very properly reply, on their own part, that the *only important* thing was to determine that if not the *language*, yet the conception which it designated was derived substantially from the Bible.†

* Christ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγος, Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτός, ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς, παρωτότου πάσης τῆς κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννημένος. That Christ was a Divine Being, the Creator of all other existence, that he came into existence prior to the whole temporal system, Arius also certainly supposed; and between a γεννητός ἐκ Θεοῦ and κτίσις, there was, in fact, according to his view, no difference.

† Ὅτι οἱ καὶ μὴ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰσιν αἱ λέξεις, ἄλλα τῶν ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν διανοίαν ἔχουσι καὶ ταυτὴν ἐκφωτοῦμεναι σημαίνουσι. Athanas. de decretis synodi Nicenæ, s. 21.

But although this symbol appeared satisfactory to the doctrinal interest of the ruling party in the Eastern church, yet the advocates of the Anti-Arian system of unity had still this very circumstance to object to in it, that it still left a foothold for the whole Arian doctrine.*

The party of the bishop Alexander was satisfied, it is true, with these articles of faith; but at the same time they declared, that, as the expressions of this creed could still be explained

Eusebius observes, in his pastoral letter, that nobody could bring any objection against this confession of faith. But Eustathius of Antioch says, that this creed was received with marks of universal disapprobation, and demolished before the eyes of all. Eustathius, however, the warm opponent of Eusebius, is liable to suspicion in what he here says. Moreover, his report stands in contradiction with all we know respecting the predominant tendency of the Eastern church in this and the next succeeding times. It is impossible to see what could give offence to the Eastern bishops in this symbol of faith. The fourth Antiochian creed, which afterwards obtained especial authority with the major portion of the Eastern church, coincided in the main with this creed of Eusebius. The Nicene creed itself manifestly grew out of this Eusebian formula; with the simple additions of the antitheses to Arianism, and of the Homousion. Besides, the account of Athanasius evinces that the council was in the first place satisfied with those general definitions which alone Eusebius meant to express. In his *Epistola ad Afros*, s. 5, he says, that the bishops originally would have established, instead of the Arian definitions, the expressions more generally recognized, which were contained in the scriptures themselves (*τὰς τῶν γραφῶν ὁμολογουμένας λέξεις*), as, for example, the expression *ἐκ Θεοῦ εἶναι τῇ φύσει*, the expression that the Son was the *δύναμις σοφία μονὴ τοῦ πατρὸς*, *Θεὸς ἀληθινός*, and this in fact agrees entirely with that which Eusebius designed. In the book de decretis, s. n., Athanasius says, the intencion at first was simply to establish that the Son of God was the *εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς*, *ὁμοιος τι καὶ ἀπαρμολάκτος κατὰ πάντα τῷ πατρὶ*, *καὶ ἀτριπτος καὶ ἀεί καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ εἶναι ἀδιαίρετος*. These definitions, too, agree very well with the Eusebian system of doctrine, and with the objects which he wished to accomplish at the council. Had these articles only been established, then, for the present, the internal controversies in the bosom of the Oriental church would have been hushed. It is also possible to reconcile the account of Eustathius with the other accounts which we have cited, if we suppose that he is speaking, not of a creed proposed by Eusebius of Cæsarea, but of one proposed by Eusebius of Nicomedia, in which this latter, to judge by the fragment quoted in Ambrose, l. III de fide, c. 7, had endeavoured to defend the Arian conception of the Son of God. Comp. Theodoret. l. 7. Everything goes, then, to confirm the fact of the preponderance which originally existed of the Eusebian, or, as it was afterwards styled, Semi-Arian party. In accordance with the truth, and agreeing with Eusebius, Athanasius also reports, that the council was not satisfied with

by the Arians after their own sense, it was absolutely necessary to add such other propositions as would effectually exclude the blasphemous doctrines of Arius; and this party had on its side the powerful suffrage of the emperor himself.* Constantine had, without doubt, been brought to a decision by the influence of those bishops who happened last to possess the most authority with him, namely, Hosius and his asso-

these articles, for the very reason that it was remarked that the Arians understood and interpreted them in their own way. But when now he proceeds to derive the additions inserted in opposition to Arianism, and with a view to preclude the possibility of its introduction, from the same bishops who had at first proposed these other articles, he must, without any doubt, have here confounded the two parties together. In truth, it is, abstractly considered, in the highest degree improbable that those who aimed at a marked opposition to Arianism would, in the first place, propose articles respecting which they knew beforehand that the Arians would be willing to subscribe to them. Besides, it might not be so easy, in considering the transactions of so numerous an assembly, where everything perhaps did not proceed according to the strictest order, accurately to discriminate what belonged to the different parties, especially for one who himself contemplated the whole under the bias of a party interest. So, in fact, Eustathius of Antioch says himself: Τὸ παρὲς διὰ τὸν τῆς πολυανθρίας ἄχλον οὐχ' οἷός τε ἐμὶ γράφειν.

* Athanasius represents everything as proceeding solely from the bishops themselves, and makes no mention whatever of the influence of the emperor; which, at his particular point of view, was natural. But Eusebius represents everything as proceeding, in the first place, solely from the emperor. The latter calls upon the bishops to adopt the creed of Eusebius, and simply to add to it the word *Homousion*, the right way of understanding which he explains. From these additional clauses, recommended by the emperor himself, the bishops were led to make several other antithetic additions; and thus arose the Nicene creed. Athanasius and Eusebius may both be right, and both be wrong,—both, according to their different party-interest, giving prominence to one thing and suppressing another. The proposal concerning the *Homousion* may first have come from the part of the bishops; but as it met with opposition, the emperor, whom the bishop Hosius of Cordova and others had made familiar with the part which, in pursuance of their objects, he was to play at the council, took up the word, recommended the *Homousion*, and declared himself to be satisfied of the inoffensiveness of this expression. There may be some truth at bottom in the account of Philostorgius, I. 7, that Alexander, previously to the opening of the Nicene council, had combined with the party of the bishop Hosius of Cordova, that is, with the court party in Nicomedia, at a synod, to establish the *Homousion*. The voice of the emperor had, with many bishops, more weight than it ought to have had according to the principles of the gospel. The party of Alexander now ventured with the more boldness to press the other antithetic definitions, which followed, as a matter of course,

ciates ; and he decided in favour of the addition of the Homooousion. If we may credit the report of Eusebius, the emperor himself even dogmatized on the question, how the Homooousion ought to be understood ; how it was not to be conceived under any image of sense, as if the one divine essence had been separated into several homogeneous parts. This might have been a point often discussed in his presence ; since it was well known, that the occasion which it gave for sensuous representations was the common objection of the Orientals to the Homooousion. The party of Alexander, who now had on their side the weight of the imperial authority, proceeded to require, in addition to the Homooousion, still other antithetic clauses, which had the same object in view. Perhaps it had been agreed on by the heads of the dogmatical court-party at that time, that the declaration of the emperor in favour of the Homooousion should be made the watch-word for proposing a still more complete antithesis to Arianism. In this way, by the union of the antithetic clauses with the articles of faith proposed by Eusebius, was produced the famous Nicene creed.* Moreover, the condemnation, by name, of the main characteristic propositions of Arius was adopted into this creed ; and the condemnatory sentence was passed, not merely upon the doctrines, but, according to the previous custom, doctrines and persons were put together, and the individuals condemned also, who had proposed such offensive things.

Now, although the majority of the council might perhaps agree in the articles against that part of the Arian creed which placed the Son of God on a level with creatures,† yet the definitions of the *ὁμοούσιον* and of the *γεννήσις ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*

the Homooousion. But Eusebius preferred rather to have it appear that he yielded to the authority of the emperor than to that of the other bishops ; and he imagined also that he could best justify his conduct to his community, if he adduced the authority of the emperor, if he declared that he had yielded to a formula proposed and recommended by the emperor himself.

* To the phrase *Θεός* i.e. *Θεῶν* was added, in opposition to the Arian mode of understanding the idea of the Godhead in reference to Christ (see above), the word *ἀληθινός* ; — to *γεννῆναι*, with a view to guard against the Arian practice of identifying it with *πλάσσειν*, was added *ἐκ* *κοινηντα*.

† The opposition between *Θεός* and *πνεῦμα* — *γεννῆναι* and *κοινηντα*.

were at variance with the prevailing Oriental type of doctrine. Hence there arose much opposition to these definitions: on the first day after they were presented, Eusebius of Cæsarea absolutely refused his assent to them.* But after many explanations he yielded for the sake of peace, as he says in the pastoral letter to his church, which he sent from Nice,†—interpreting the new articles of the creed according to the sense of his own doctrinal system, not without some degree of disingenuous sophistry.‡ The principal article respecting the Homocousion, which, in fact, had already been approved, even by the peace-loving Dionysius of Alexandria, in another sense than that in which it was intended to establish it at Nice, Eusebius, by taking advantage of the unsettled use of philosophical and doctrinal terms in those times, could easily explain in accordance with his own views. This proposition, according to his interpretation, denoted nothing else than the exaltation of the Son of God above all comparison with created beings, and his perfect likeness to the Father.§ It perhaps may be the case that Eusebius, as he avowed in

* Athanas. decret. S. n. s. 3. *Πρὸς μίας ἀνοῦμνος, ὅμως ὑστερον υπογράφας.*

† Τοῦ τῆς τριῆς ὁμοῦς σκοποῦ πρὸς ὀφθαλμῶν ἡμῶν κειμένου.

‡ This properly betrays itself only in the case of one article, if Eusebius could approve the condemnation of the Arian proposition, that the Son of God *πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν*. This proposition of Arius does in fact perfectly agree with Eusebius's system of faith (see above); and at least some similar proposition seemed to himself necessary, in order to hold fast the notion of absolute causality, which was to be attributed to God the Father alone. It was a dubious matter, then, for him to join in this anathema. He got along by a sophistical interpretation, referring the *γεννηθῆναι*, in the condemned proposition, to the human birth; and so he found no difficulty, as he himself declared, in receiving this also; as, in truth, the doctrine of Christ's divine existence before his birth was one universally acknowledged. By this last remark, however, he in fact refuted his own interpretation; for how could it have occurred to any one to set up a counter proposition to an erroneous doctrine which nobody maintained? Athanasius was not slow to take advantage of the weak spot which Eusebius here exposed; and objected to him that, by such an interpretation, he threw the suspicion of entertaining such an erroneous doctrine on his friend Arius himself, against whom this condemnatory article had been framed.

§ Παραστατικὸν τὸ μηδμίαν ἱμφειρίαν πρὸς τὰ γενεὰ πτίσματα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ φέρειν, μόνον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ κατὰ πάντα τρέπον ὁμοίον εἶναι. When Athanasius, then (de decret. synod. nic. s. 3), accuses Eusebius of having, by his approbation of the Homocousion in his pastoral letter revoked his earlier doctrine as being incorrect, the charge is altogether untrue; for, as

his pastoral letter, explained himself before the council of Nicæ itself, with regard to the sense in which he received the Homœousion. The important point with the emperor Constantine was, that the proposition regarding the Homœousion, of the importance of which he had been persuaded, should be received by all: what the properly orthodox and what the heterodox sense might be, in the interpretation of this article, it is hardly probable that he could so nicely distinguish.* With perfect honesty Eusebius might condemn the Arian formulas, especially since they contained distinctions not to be met with in scripture; and since all the strife and confusion in the church had grown out of the employment of such distinctions, the use of which, therefore, he himself had always carefully avoided.

† There were many others who adopted the Nicene creed in the same sense with Eusebius, interpreting it in accordance with their own doctrinal system; so that the *ὁμοούσιον* was for them nothing more than a designation of the *ὁμοιότης κατ' οὐσίαν* (likeness in respect to essence). At first seventeen bishops, who probably belonged to the strictly Arian party, declined to go with the majority. But as the creed was to be made known under the imperial authority, and threatened all who would not adopt it with the loss of their places, and condemnation as refractory subjects,† the greater part of these yielded through fear; and there remained, finally, but two bishops besides Arius, namely, Theonas of Marmarica in Libya, and Secundus of Ptolemais, who declared without reserve against the Nicene creed. The two zealous personal friends of Arius themselves, Eusebius of Nicomedia and

Eusebius expresses himself, it is clear that he interpreted this distinction only in accordance with the doctrinal system which he had constantly taught.

* If it is true, as Eusebius reports, that the emperor interpreted the condemnation of the proposition, *πρὸ τοῦ γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν*, in the sense that the Son of God, before he came into existence in *ἐκγίγναι*, already existed, like all things else in the Father, in *δυνάμει*,—it would, we must admit, be exceedingly plain, how little familiar Constantine was with the system he would defend, and how easily he could be satisfied with any interpretations, provided only the forms were adhered to.

† *Contra divina statuta venientes, i. e. statuta imperatoris*, according to the diplomatic language of those times. So Rufinus expresses it, I. 5, in the sense of the emperor.

Theognis of Nice, subscribed the creed ; declaring with Eusebius of Cæsarea, that they yielded for the sake of peace, after having expressed their views as to the way in which it ought to be understood, so as to be free from all objection.* Still they refused to subscribe with the rest the condemnatory clauses against the Arian doctrines, not, as they avowed, because they did not agree with the others as to the doctrinal matter, but because, according to the way in which they had learned to understand the doctrines of Arius from his written and oral communications, they could not believe that he had actually taught the doctrines he was accused of teaching. At that time the thing was overlooked ; but Arius and his two faithful friends were excommunicated as teachers of error from the church, deposed from their spiritual office, and by the emperor Constantine condemned to banishment. The latter was at this time overflowing with a fanatical hatred of the doctrines of Arius, which now appeared to him as blasphemous, and subversive of all Christianity ; and this fanaticism impelled him already to apply all the expedients of the Byzantine despotism to suppress these doctrines entirely. In an edict issued at this time, he places Arius in the same class with Porphyry, the antagonist of Christianity ; and directed that all the writings of Arius, as those of Porphyry, should be burned,—the penalty of death even being threatened against those who should be detected in any clandestine attempt to preserve these writings. While Constantine was in this state of feeling, Eusebius and Theognis, who had already rendered themselves suspected by the emperor in refusing to subscribe the condemnatory clause, could not long remain protected against his displeasure ; but it turned out, as Theonas and Secundus had foretold them, that they soon shared the same fate with the latter. Three months after the close of the council,† they also were deposed from their places and banished.

In fact, however, the manner in which the controversies had been decided by the council of Nice could only contain the seeds for new disputes ; for there was here no cordial union springing freely, by a natural course of development, out of inward conviction, but a forced and artificial union of men,

* For they were afterwards able to appeal to the fact that they had done this, in their memorial sent to the bishops, cited in Socrates, l. 14.

† Philostorg. l. 9.

still, widely separated by their different modes of thinking, on a creed which had been imposed on them, and which was differently expounded according to the different doctrinal interests of the several parties. Thus it happened, that while for the present no party ventured as yet to come out decidedly against the Homœousion, still those who had received it, explaining it to mean Homoiousion, accused the others, who interpreted it and held it fast in its proper and original signification, of Sabellianism; while the latter accused the former of Tritheism. We have an illustration of this in the disputes between the bishop Eustathius of Antioch, and the bishop Eusebius of Cæsarea, — two men radically opposed to each other before, in their whole theological bent; the former being a zealous opponent, the other a no less zealous adherent, of the school of Origen.

Yet the major part of the eastern church would naturally strive to rid themselves of the imposed articles of the Nicene creed; and as Constantine, without an independent judgment of his own, and a well-grounded insight into these doctrinal controversies, was governed by the changing influence of the different parties at court, so that which had procured for the Homœousion a momentary victory in the Eastern church might soon take a turn in the very opposite direction. Constantine's sister Constantia, the widow of Licinius, who possessed great influence with her brother, maintained the best understanding with Eusebius of Cæsarea; and she had taken as her spiritual guide a presbyter who had attached himself to the Arian party, and who found means of convincing her that Arius had been unjustly condemned.*

On her death, in the year 327, Constantia very earnestly recommended the presbyter above mentioned to her brother. He acquired the confidence of the emperor, and succeeded in persuading him also that injustice had been done to Arius, and that personal passions had had much more to do in these

* Might we place any reliance on the testimony of the Arian historian Philostorgius, h. e. I. 8, the advice of Constantia had had some influence on the issue of the Nicene council itself. As she must have been well acquainted with her brother's habits, she advised her friends at the Nicene council to receive for the present the Homœousion, which her brother was now firmly resolved to hold fast, and gave it their own interpretation;—means would very soon be found to draw him off from it again.

disputes than any interest in behalf of sound doctrine. Constantine had already once invited Arius to visit the court; but the latter, it seems, could not feel confidence enough in the emperor's intentions. He now sent a second express message, assuring Arius that it was the emperor's purpose to show him favour, and send him back to Alexandria. Arius presented to the emperor a confession of faith, in which, without entering into the points of difference, he expressed in very general language his belief in the doctrine of the Father, Son,* and Holy Ghost, taught by scripture and by the common tradition of the church. He besought the emperor to put a stop to these idle controversies on mere speculative questions,† so that schisms might be healed, and all united in one might pray for the peaceable reign of the emperor and for his whole family. Constantine was satisfied with this confession. Arius was again received to favour (between the years 328 and 329); and his two friends, Theognis and Eusebius of Nicomedia, were now easily enabled to obtain their recall.‡ We perceive from the confession of Arius, and from the satisfaction with which Constantine received it, what were the prevailing views of the latter respecting these matters at the present time. After having been enlisted but for a short period in favour of the Homoousion, he had been drawn back

* On this point the identity of the *κτίσις* and *γενήσις* was presupposed, entirely in accordance with his doctrine: Τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων γεννημένον Θεὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο.

† Ζητήματα καὶ πειισολογίαι.

‡ The arguments which have been urged against the genuineness of the above-cited letter of these two bishops, by which they sought to be restored to favour, are not decisive; many of them being simply grounded on the view which must be taken of the Nicene council in the Catholic church. This letter possesses, on the contrary, every mark of genuineness. But, according to this letter, we must necessarily place the recall of Arius before the return of these two bishops, as the letter expressly presupposes it. The reasons which induced Walch to place the recall of Arius at a later period, even so late as A.D. 330, are not important; for although Socrates says that Arius had been called by the emperor to Constantinople, yet it by no means follows from this, that the consecration of the new residence, A.D. 330, had preceded; for first, as it respects the place, Socrates might easily be in an error, and by an anachronism substitute Constantinople for Nicomedia; or it may even be, that Constantine happened at the very time that he sent for Arius, to be at Byzantium, before that city had as yet been converted into the imperial residence.

again to those earlier views which would so much more readily present themselves to a layman contemplating the matter simply in its outward aspects, that personal passions and a self-willed, disputatious spirit had given to these *questions*, which did not pertain in the least to the essentials of Christianity, an undue importance. The emperor entertaining this view of the matter, all who agreed in representing the doctrinal differences as unimportant would especially recommend themselves to his favour; while all who were unwilling, for the sake of gratifying the emperor, to moderate their zeal in behalf of a truth which they found to be intimately connected with the essence of Christianity, would easily become suspected and hated by him as uneasy, contentious, and disorderly men.

Hence may be explained the contests which, first and pre-eminently, the remarkable person had to pass through who had now become the head of the Homoousion party in the Eastern church. For soon after the conclusion of the council of Nice, the bishop Alexander had died, and was succeeded by the archdeacon Athanasius, a man far his superior in intellect and resolute energy. Athanasius had probably been already, up to this very time, the soul of the party in favour of the Homoousion; and it was by his influence that the bishop Alexander had been led to decide that nothing should be yielded in order to the restoration of Arius.* Moreover, he had already distinguished himself at the Nicene council by the zeal and acuteness with which he defended the doctrine of the unity of essence, and combated Arianism. By pursuing, with strict consistency and unwavering firmness, during an active life of nearly half a century, and amid every variety of fortune and many persecutions and sufferings, the same object, in opposition to those parties whose doctrinal views were either unsettled in themselves, or liable to veer about with every change of the air at court, he contributed in a great measure to promote the victory of the Homoousion in the Eastern church. If we consider the connection of thoughts and ideas in the doctrinal system of this father, we shall doubtless be led to see that, in contending for the Homoousion, he by no means contended for a mere speculative formula,

* For one of the charges brought against him by his opponents, see Athanas. apolog. c. Arianos, s. 6.

standing in no manner of connection with what constitutes the essence of Christianity; that, in this controversy, it was by no means a barely dialectic or speculative interest, but in reality an essentially Christian interest, which actuated him. On the holding fast to the Homousion depended, in his view, the whole unity of the Christian consciousness of God, the completeness of the revelation of God in Christ, the reality of the redemption which Christ wrought, and of the communion with God restored by him to man. "If Christ," so argued Athanasius against the Arian doctrine, "differed from other creatures simply as being the only creature immediately produced by God, his essence being wholly distinct from the essence of God, then he could not bring the creature into fellowship with God, since we must be constrained to conceive of something still, intermediate between him, as a creature, and the divine essence which differed from him, something whereby *he* might stand in communion with God;—and this intermediate being would be precisely the Son of God in the proper sense. In analyzing the conception of God communicated to the creature, it would be necessary to arrive at last at the conception of that which requires nothing intermediate in order to communion with God; which does not participate in God's essence as something foreign from itself, but which is itself the self-communicating essence of God.* This is the only Son of God, the being who can be so called in the proper sense. The expressions Son of God and divine generation are of a symbolical nature, and denote simply the communication of the divine essence. It is only on the supposition that Christ is in this sense alone the proper Son of God, that he can make rational creatures children of God. It is the Logos who imparts himself to them, dwells within them, through whom they live in God—the Son of God within them, through the fellowship with whom they become themselves children of God." It is here seen how to Athanasius the idea of the Homousion presented itself in connection with what constitutes the root and groundwork of the entire Christian life. While the Arians maintained that it was

* See, e. g., Athanas. orat. I. c. Arianos, s. 16. Τὸ ὅλως μετίχισθαι τὸν Θεόν, ὅσον ἔστι λίγαν ὅτι καὶ γινώσκει. — Αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ υἱὸς οὐδενὸς μετίχου, τὸ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μετεχόμενον, τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς, αὐτοῦ γὰρ τοῦ υἱοῦ μετεχόντες, τοῦ Θεοῦ μετίχουν λεγόμεθα.

impossible to distinguish the conceptions Son of God and a generation from God, from the conceptions created being and a creation, without falling into sensuous, anthropomorphic representations, Athanasius, on the contrary, taught that all human expressions of God were of a symbolic nature, taken from temporal things, and therefore liable to be misconceived, unless the idea lying at the bottom were freed from the elements of time and sense, and the *same attribute*, predicated of God, understood in a different manner from what it would be when predicated of creatures. Even God's act of creation, in order not to be misconceived, must be distinguished from the human mode of producing and forming. As the Arians admitted that, according to John v. 23, divine worship belonged to Christ, Athanasius accused them of showing that honour to a creature, according to their notions of Christ, which was due to God alone; consequently, of falling into idolatry. From this coherence of the doctrines which Athanasius here defended with his whole Christian consciousness, it may be well conceived that he must have considered himself bound by his duty as a pastor not to admit into his church a teacher who held forth a system which appeared to him to be so thoroughly unchristian.

After the patrons of Arius had resorted in vain to friendly representations, petitions, and threats, for the purpose of inducing Athanasius to receive back the former into the church, the emperor *commanded* him to receive Arius, and all his friends who were willing to connect themselves once more with his church; and, unless he did so, informed him that he should be deposed from his station, and sent into exile.* Athanasius, however, was not to be intimidated by such threats, but firmly declared to the emperor, that his duty as a pastor did not permit him to receive the teachers of false doctrines into the fellowship of the church; and this steadfast refusal of a man acting under the consciousness of his vocation, and in the feeling of his duty, produced so much effect as this, that Constantine did not urge him further, nor carry his threat into execution. But still this incident could not have left an altogether

* A fragment of the letter is preserved in Athanasius, apolog. c. Arian. s. 59. The threatening words of the emperor are: Ἀποστείλω παραύτικα τὸν καὶ καθαιρήσοντά σε ἐξ ἡμῶν κελύσεως καὶ τῶν τόπων μεταστήσοντα.

favourable impression on the emperor's mind, since Athanasius appeared to him in the light of an obstinate recusant; and hence his enemies would be more easily listened to in bringing their new accusations against him. The most weighty charge was, that Athanasius had sent to a person in Egypt—otherwise unknown to us, but who was reported to have harboured a design of conspiracy against the emperor—a sum of money to aid him in the prosecution of his purpose. Constantine ordered him, A.D. 332, to present himself personally, at Psammathia, a suburb of Nicomedia, where the emperor was residing at that time. The personal appearance of Athanasius, a man of remarkable power over the minds of others, seems for the moment to have over-awed the soul of Constantine. He not only acknowledged the above-mentioned accusation to be groundless, but such was the effect left on him by the presence of Athanasius, that, in his letter to the church at Alexandria, he styles him a man of God.* In this letter he lamented the existing divisions, and recommended charity and concord. It is easy to see, that the preservation of peace and unity in the church was of far more importance, in the estimation of Constantine, than all matters pertaining to doctrine. For the moment, the enemies of Athanasius now appeared to him to be the authors of the disturbances and divisions; but this impression was of no long duration, and he continued to be governed by the influence sometimes of this and sometimes of the other party. Occasions were not wanting for bringing new accusations against Athanasius; for, in the circumstances by which he was immediately surrounded, there existed abundant materials for agitation, which was sometimes rather excited than quelled by his zeal not unmixed with passion. It happened, for instance, that the Arian and the Meletian schisms, though originating in widely different interests, yet broke out there at one and the same time. The efforts of Athanasius to bring back the Meletians to the dominant church might, besides, especially amidst so excitable and passionate a people as the Alexandrians, easily lead to scenes of disturbance, proceeding to a greater length than those who were the occasion of them intended. But he was sometimes induced to resort even to forcible measures for suppressing divisions in his arch-

episcopal diocese.* The frequent tours of visitation, which, as a conscientious bishop, he made to the various parts of his diocese, and in which he was usually accompanied by individuals belonging both to the clergy and laity of the churches which he visited, gave frequent occasion for such disputes between the two heated parties, which led to scenes of violence. Passionate party hatred would, of course, take advantage of these occasions to collect against him a mass of extravagant charges. Although the emperor could not give credence to the various and strange things which were brought against him, yet he believed, doubtless, that Athanasius, by his passionate and violent proceedings, might have given some occasion for these charges.† He at first, in the year 335, appointed a synod to be held under the presidency of Eusebius of Cæsarea, with full powers to inquire into the charges laid against Athanasius, and to restore things to quiet. Athanasius might, not without good reason, protest against the decision of a spiritual tribunal, at which his declared antagonist presided as judge. But as it had been determined by the emperor to celebrate the *tricenarian* festival of his reign by dedicating on that occasion the magnificent church which he had erected over the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem, and many bishops had been invited to participate in this celebration, Constantine directed, in order that they might be prepared to engage in these solemn rites with quiet minds, that they should first take earnest measures for putting an end to the divisions in the church. For this purpose, the bishops were to assemble, first, at Tyre, in the year 335, and there inquire into the charges brought against Athanasius. The latter might, indeed, very justly, for the same reasons as in the case of the first synod above mentioned, protest also against this spiritual tribunal, whose members belonged, for the

** Epiphanius, who assuredly would say nothing tending to the disparagement of Athanasius, says of him in this respect, hæres. 68, Meletian. *ἀνὰρχαζον, ἐβιάζοντο*.

† In the letter to the synod at Tyre, he speaks only of some who, through the rage of a morbid disputatious spirit, embroiled everything. *Οὐχ ὕγιους φιλονεικίας ὁστῶν τινὲς ἐλαυνόμενοι πάντα σύγχυιν ἐπὶ χειρῶσιν*. Euseb. vit. Constantin. l. IV. c. 42. Even Eusebius of Cæsarea, whose delicacy deserves respectful notice in touching so lightly upon the Arian controversies in his life of Constantine—even he says, in this instance, only the taunting insinuations of an immoderate disputatious spirit. L. c. c. 41.

most part, to the opposite party; but Constantine threatened to enforce his obedience by compulsion, if he presumed again to treat with contempt the imperial command.* Athanasius succeeded, before this tribunal, to refute a part of the charges which were laid against him. With regard to the rest, a committee was nominated, who should repair to Egypt, and investigate everything on the spot; but it was unfairly decreed, that no one belonging to the party of the accused should be allowed to accompany this commission, so that he was curtailed of the means of proving his innocence, and wholly abandoned to the party proceedings of his antagonists. This investigation, conducted in so partial a manner, would of course turn out unfavourably for Athanasius; he therefore appealed to the emperor himself, and proceeded to Constantinople. On his entrance into the city, he rode straightway to meet the emperor, accompanied by a few attendants. Constantine at first refused to allow him a hearing, yet, as he received accounts from other quarters of the party proceedings of the synod at Tyre, he saw no way in which he could decline a revision of the previous investigation. But a few members of that synod, the most violent enemies of Athanasius, appeared at Constantinople, to take part in this new investigation. On the present occasion they let the earlier accusations drop, and brought against him a new one, which was altogether suited to exas-

* We may here introduce a characteristic anecdote from the history of this tribunal. Among the witnesses who appeared in favour of Athanasius, was an old confessor of Egypt, by the name of Potamon, who, in the time of the Dioclesian persecution, had been thrown into prison at the same time with Eusebius, and who had had one of his eyes bored out. This person, full of zeal for Athanasius, said to Eusebius: "Who can tolerate this? Thou sittest there to judge Athanasius, who stands before thee an innocent person! Dost thou recollect, that we were in the dungeon together, and that I was deprived of an eye? But thou didst not become a martyr, and hast all thy members still unharmed. How couldst thou have so escaped from the prison, unless thou didst either do what was not permitted, or else profess thy willingness to do it?" This was unquestionably an inference on very slender grounds; for many circumstances might operate to cause favour to be shown to one which was denied to another. Eusebius thought it not proper to vindicate himself against this charge, but simply said, losing for a moment the equanimity, indeed, which it behoved him to possess as a judge: "Shall we not now believe your accusers? If you venture to exercise such tyranny here, how much more will you do it in your own country!" See Epiphan. l. c.

perate the feelings of Constantine against Athanasius.* He was reported to have said, that it lay in his power to hinder the arrival of the convoy of grain necessary to be sent semi-annually from Alexandria to supply provisions for the city of the imperial residence.† Whether the truth really was that Constantine in some sort believed this charge, or whether he only deemed it necessary to affect that he believed it, in order to get rid of a man who was a constant mark and butt of contention, and thus restore quiet, it is enough that he banished him, A.D. 336, to Trier.‡

As nothing now stood in the way of the restoration of Arius to the Alexandrian church, he was, after having been solemnly received back into the communion of the church by the synod convened at Jerusalem for the purpose of consecrating the new edifice, sent back to Alexandria. But in the community, which was devoted with an enthusiastic attachment to their bishop Athanasius, new disturbances arose. Constantine, to whom the preservation of peace was the main thing, sent, A.D. 336, for Arius to come to Constantinople, in order that it might be examined how far he had been concerned in these disturbances. He was obliged to present to the emperor a confession of faith; and drew up one in simple language, couched in scriptural expressions, without doubt similar to the former one already mentioned. He needed not to deny his convictions in order to satisfy the emperor; for although the latter was unwilling absolutely to relinquish the Homoousion, since it had been once published under the imperial sanction, yet, notwithstanding all this, he was far from being inclined to the views of Athanasius. But the sincerity of Arius in his confession had been suspected by him. He required of him an oath to testify his sincerity; and as the confession Arius had laid down contained nothing, judged from his own point of

* For, according to Eunapius (see above), he is said to have caused the pagan philosopher, Sopatros, to be executed on a similar charge.

† Whether this had reference to the political influence of Athanasius, or to the magical arts ascribed to him, is uncertain.

‡ The observation of Constans, in the letter written after his father's death, respecting the disposition of the latter towards Athanasius, and the vacancy of the episcopate at Alexandria, may render it rather probable than otherwise, that it was Constantine's intention to remove Athanasius only for a short season, with a view to the restoration of quiet.

view, which was at variance with his doctrines, he would take such an oath with a clear conscience.*

* In comparing the different accounts of these events, we perceive how the truth here became continually more and more distorted by the prejudices of party hatred. Socrates, I. 38, following Sozomen and Theodoret, relates that Constantine asked Arius whether he abode by the articles of the Nicene council. Arius immediately declared himself ready to subscribe the Nicene creed. The emperor, surprised at this, required of him an oath, and Arius gave it; but in so doing resorted to the following artifice. He had a confession, drawn up by himself, which truly expressed his convictions, concealed under his shoulders; and in giving the oath, that he so believed as he had written, he sophistically understood by this, not the Nicene creed subscribed by him at the requisition of the emperor, but that which he carried concealed about his person. This story will appear, on closer examination, to be wanting in the internal marks of probability. How should Constantine, who before this had been so easily satisfied with the confession of faith laid down by Arius, and had required of him no declaration whatever respecting the Nicene creed, have now made on him so much higher demands? How could he propose to him the question, whether he honestly followed the Nicene council, when Arius had given no occasion whatever for presuming any such thing? Nothing, moreover, could at that time certainly lie more remote from the intentions of Constantine, who at this very moment stood in the closest relations with those bishops that were decidedly opposed to the Nicene creed, than such a zeal for its articles. Everything went right with him, provided only the Nicene creed as to its form was not publicly attacked; provided only it was ignored. It may be conceived, therefore, that Constantine might be easily satisfied with a confession of faith from Arius similar to that which he had handed over to him on the former occasion. Besides, how insufficient is the voucher which Socrates gives for the truth of this story! That Arius had at that time drawn up a confession of faith, and given his oath to it, this Socrates knew from letters of the emperor himself; and this, therefore, was an undeniable fact; but the rest he had derived from the most impure of all sources, from mere hearsay,—*ἀκούη*. If, then, we had only *this* account of the matter, we might even then be enabled to infer, that the confession of faith subscribed by Arius was in no sense the Nicene creed, but that, merely in flattery to the reputation of Constantine for orthodoxy, it was converted into the Nicene creed, and that on this was fastened the charge of deception against the heretic. This conjecture respecting the true history of the matter, to which the analysis of Socrates' account would itself conduct us, is confirmed by consulting the report of Athanasius. In his *Epistola ad episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ*, s. 18, he says, Arius, when called upon by the emperor to present a confession of his faith, concealed hypocritically his godless way of thinking under simple expressions borrowed from the scriptures: "Ἐγραψεν ὁ δόλιος, κρύπτων μὲν τὰς ἰδίας τῆς ἀσεβείας λέξεις, ὑποκρινομένους δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς ὁ διάβολος, τὰ τῶν γραφῶν ῥήματα ἀπλᾶ καὶ ὡς ἐστὶ γνησiamμένα. And when the emperor thereupon required him to take an

Constantine being now perfectly convinced of the orthodoxy of Arius, the latter was to be solemnly received back to the fellowship of the church at the celebration of public worship in Constantinople. It happened to be a Sabbath (Saturday), on which day, as well as Sunday, public worship was held at Constantinople (see above). Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, a zealous advocate of the Homousion, resolutely refused to admit him; but the patrons of Arius, among the ecclesiastical court party, threatened to bring it about forcibly by an imperial command, on the following day. Alexander was thus thrown into great perplexity and embarrassment. He prostrated himself, as it is related, on the pavement before the altar, and prayed God either to remove *him* from this life, that he might not be compelled to act contrary to his conscience, or else to remove Arius; which, it must be confessed, was not a very Christian prayer. On the evening of this same day, Arius suddenly died.* Well might

oath that he had nothing else in his mind, he swore that he had never otherwise taught or conceived. In the same manner he speaks in the *Epistola ad Serapionem*, s. 2, with this difference only, that he represents him here as swearing that he had not really taught those doctrines of which the bishop Alexander had accused him. At all events, it is evident that Athanasius brings against Arius the charge of deception and hypocrisy in a way altogether unjustifiable, when he proceeds on the false assumption, that Arius was obliged to understand the words of scripture in which he expressed his confession, precisely after the same manner as he himself (Athanasius) understood them; and that in swearing to the doctrines therein expressed, he therefore incurred the guilt of hypocrisy and perjury. The fact having now been once assumed, that Arius, in this case, descended to trickery, and the confession of faith then drawn up by him having been lost, the Nicene creed was easily substituted in its place, and the way in which the heretic had managed to deceive was ever liable to receive new decorations. We might even be tempted to venture a step farther. The confession of faith drawn up the first time by Arius, agrees so perfectly with all the characters which Athanasius, in the passage above cited, ascribes to the second, that we might believe that there had been but this one confession of faith; and that either Athanasius, failing to express himself in those passages with chronological accuracy, had transposed the confession of faith which Arius presented immediately after his return from exile, on his first residence at Constantinople, to his second residence in the same city; or Socrates committed an anachronism in making Arius present such a confession of faith directly on his first residence at Constantinople.

* Here, too, we have an instance of the exaggeration of rumour. According to Socrates' report, the death occurred while Arius was proceed-

this turn of events, which no human sagacity could have foreseen, be regarded as demonstrating the vanity of all human machinations, since all that which was to be enforced by imperial power was thus frustrated at a blow. But it showed a sad want of Christian charity, when men were seen triumphing over the sudden death of the supposed blasphemer, as a divine judgment. It argued narrow-minded presumption, that they should think of measuring the unsearchable ways of holy, all-wise, and eternal love, according to visible appearances and by the standard of human passions and prejudices; should be disposed to see, in this event, a declarative sentence from on high, deciding between truth and error, a divine judgment on perjury and impiety, when the truth was, that Arius erred from honest conviction; that he had sworn to nothing but what he sincerely believed; and that he may possibly have had, at least in his internal life, more of the Christian temper than exhibited itself in the defective exposition of his belief. Even Athanasius was, in this instance, borne along with the prevailing current of opinion in his age; yet we remark with pleasure, that when he was about to describe the death of Arius, as connected with this controversy, his Christian feelings recoiled. Thmuis, the bishop of Serapion, having made several inquiries of him respecting the Arian controversy, and also respecting the death of Arius, he declared that to the first he had cheerfully replied, but to the last not without a struggle; for he feared lest it might seem as if he triumphed over the death of the man. And in another place, he introduces this account with a remark which surely ought to have led him to suppress it altogether.*—"Death is the common lot of all men. We should never triumph over the death of any man, even though he be our enemy; since no one can know but that before evening the same lot may be his own." The adherents of Arius, on the other hand, sought to account for his sudden demise by a supernatural

ing in triumph from the imperial palace. On his way to the church he was suddenly seized with extreme pain, accompanied with relaxation of the bowels: in discharging from them he expired. The last-mentioned fact had some foundation; but the order of time has been altered to favour the miraculous aspect of the occurrence; for, according to the report of Athanasius, the death of Arius took place on the evening of this Sabbath.

* *Ad episcopos Ægypti et Libyæ*, s. 19.

cause of another kind, which implicated their opponents. They spread it abroad that Arius had been cut off by the sorceries of his enemies.* This accusation is of some importance, as it shows there was no possible ground for suspecting that he was poisoned.

With the death of Arius, this contest could not cease; for the personal character of the man had little to do with it. It was, in truth, a contest between different doctrinal tendencies springing up out of the development of Christian doctrine, to the outbreak of which Arius had only given the first impulse; and it was not until *this contest* itself had been decided, that peace could be restored again to the church. Add to this, that the contest between proper Arianism and the doctrine of the Homoousion gradually passed over into the contest between the major part of the Eastern church and the minority who adhered firmly to the Homoousion creed. The death of Arius made a difference in but one respect, that, while before several important men of the middle party above described had been deterred by their personal interest in favour of Arius, from distinctly condemning his peculiar doctrines, they now hesitated no longer to renounce all manner of connection with him, so as to be able simply to declare—what to them seemed the only important thing—their *opposition to the Homoousion*. In addition to this, another event connected with consequences of more universal moment, soon ensued,—the death of Constantine, in 337. His son Constantius, who succeeded him in the empire of the East, was inclined, even much more than his father had been, to intermeddle with the internal affairs of the church. The emperor Constantine had not, at least, in the theologian forgotten the emperor,—had not lost sight of the political interest, in his concern for matters of doctrine. But this easily came to be the case with Constantius. If Constantine had, for a moment, suffered himself to be drawn into too warm a participation in theological controversies, yet, after he was made aware of the mischievous consequences of such a course, he soon reverted to the principle of holding *fast simply to the interests of peace and quiet*. It was not so with Constantius. The latter engaged in doctrinal controversies in the same way as if he were a bishop, only clothed with the power of an emperor. His mistake with regard to

* Sozom. hist. eccles. l. II. c. 29.

the limits of his princely authority—which he extended to things lying beyond its rightful province—brought its own punishment along with it; for, while he imagined everything was directed by his own will, he was only the servant of others, who knew how to govern him,* and particularly of the *eunuchs*, who, in their capacity of chamberlains,† possessed unbounded power at his court.‡ Now it was precisely in this quarter that the Anti-Nicene party acquired the greatest influence. That very Arian presbyter, for instance, who stood so high in the confidence of the emperor Constantine, had handed over his will to his son Constantius, and thus opened for himself a way of access to the latter. He was attached to the court, and succeeded in gaining over to the interests of his own system of faith the first chamberlain Eusebius, and by his means the other eunuchs, the empress, and finally the emperor himself.§ Thus the doctrinal controversies of the day became the fashionable topic of conversation at court. Hence, it spread to the people of high rank, and then still lower down; so that, as Socrates expresses it, a war of dialectics was carried on in every family; or, as Gregory of Nyssa relates, the Homocousion came to be discussed in the bakers' shops, at the tables of the money-changers, and even in the market for old clothes. These effects, however, did not develop themselves in their whole extent, till at a somewhat later period.||

The immediate consequence of the change of government

* Athanas. hist. Arianor. ad monachos. sec. 70. Μετ' ἐλευθέρου σχήματος καὶ νόματος δούλος τῶν ἐλκόντων αὐτόν.

† Præpositi sacri cubiculi.

‡ Athanas. l. c. Πολλοὶ δὲ, μάλλον δὲ τὸ ὅλον εἶσιν εὐνουχοὶ παρὰ Κωνσταντίῳ, καὶ πάντα δύνανται παρ' αὐτοῦ.

§ Socrat. II. 2.

|| A remarkably vivid picture of this rage for doctrinal dispute among all ranks of people in Constantinople, is drawn by Gregory of Nyssa, in his Oratio de Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti, T. III. f. 466: "Every corner and nook of the city is full of men who discuss incomprehensible subjects; the streets, the markets, the people who sell old clothes, those who sit at the tables of the money-changers, those who deal in provisions. Ask a man, how many oboli it comes to, he gives you a specimen of dogmatizing on generated and ungenerated being. Inquire the price of bread; you are answered, 'The Father is greater than the Son, and the Son subordinate to the Father.' Ask if the bath is ready, and you are answered, 'The Son of God was created from nothing.'"

was, that Constantine the younger, who had obtained the government over a part of the West, sent back Athanasius once more to Alexandria, with a letter to his community in which he declared that his father had already entertained the same purpose, and had been prevented from executing it only by his death. Athanasius was received by his community with enthusiastic expressions of love, and entered once more with his wonted zeal into his former field of labour. He could not fail, however, to come into frequent collision with the small remaining party of the Arians and the Meletians. The enemies of Athanasius, who, at the synod of Tyre, had pronounced upon him the sentence of deposition, and who still refused to acknowledge him as a regular bishop, strove to kindle the fires of discord into a fiercer flame. They had given to the Arian party, as their bishop, a presbyter named Pistus, who never succeeded, however, in establishing his own authority. They afterwards accused Athanasius of resorting to violence at his restoration—of procuring executions and the infliction of civil penalties, and of employing for this purpose the provincial magistrates as his instruments. But the friends of Athanasius* were enabled to show that what was imputed to him had been done by the provincial magistrates independently of Athanasius, while he was still on his journey, and without any connection whatever with the doctrinal controversies; and, beyond question, the passion and rancour of a portion of his antagonists prepared them to believe anything. Meantime the last-mentioned party, assured of their power over the emperor Constantius, took advantage of a festival at the dedication of a church recently erected by him at Antioch, to open there, in the year 341, a new ecclesiastical assembly. Here the sentence of deposition, previously passed upon Athanasius, was confirmed, partly under the pretext that he had allowed himself, after having been removed by a spiritual tribunal, to be restored to his place, without any new ecclesiastical inquiry, and barely by the secular power†—although Athanasius had not recognized that former council as a regular spiritual tribunal; and although his opponents did not scruple, in other matters, to carry out many of their measures by the hand of regular power, and in part by bringing up several new charges

* See the Alexandrian synodal letter, apolog. contra Arian. s. 3.

† To this the twelfth canon of this council refers.

against him. As it was known how confidently Athanasius might rely on having the countenance of the Western church, in which the doctrine of the Homousion predominated; how much sympathy he met with during his first residence there, inasmuch as the power of Constantius did not extend into the West, it must have been feared that what was undertaken to be done against Athanasius would occasion a breach between the two churches of the East and of the West. This it was desired, if possible, to avoid: Delegates therefore were sent to the Western emperor Constans, and to the bishop Julius, of Rome. These delegates set forth the charges which had been laid against Athanasius, and sought to gain the assent of the Roman bishop, and, through him, of the more important bishops of the West; but Athanasius also sent some presbyters of his own clergy to Rome to defend him against these charges. They succeeded in refuting the accusations; and the deputies of the other party, in their embarrassment, let fall certain expressions which the Roman bishop* could, at least, so interpret as if they had appealed to the decision of a new and larger synod. He at once accepted this appeal, for very welcome to him was such an opportunity of establishing his own supreme judicial authority. He invited both parties, by their delegates, to present their cause before a synod to be assembled under his own presidency; but it had never entered the thoughts of the dominant party among the Orientals to concede to him any such supreme judicial authority. They looked upon it as a very strange affair, that he should so have misunderstood them. As their predecessors had not obtruded themselves, in the Novatian disputes, as judges over the Western church, so neither did it become him to obtrude himself as a judge in these controversies of the Eastern church: he was not to suppose that, because he presided as bishop over a larger city, that he was on that account of any more consequence than other bishops.†

* We have in this case, to be sure, only the report of one party; viz. the Roman-Athanasian.

† To this objection the Roman bishop, Julius, gave a very adroit and keen reply, which doubtless must have been felt by many of these bishops, whose unclerical ambition interested them so much in the business of exchanging their bishoprics in small towns for those in the principal cities and capitals; as, for example, Eusebius of Nicomedia, who contrived to get his bishopric of Berytus in Phœnicia exchanged for

Meanwhile, as the above-mentioned Pistus found it impossible to acquire any authority at Alexandria, having been perhaps from the first jostled along to that office by the intrigues of a few, the bishops who were now assembled at Antioch named as bishop of Alexandria, in place of Athanasius, a certain Cappadocian of a violent and headstrong temper, by the name of Gregorius. In the name of the emperor, he was installed as bishop of Alexandria by an armed force; and those who refused to acknowledge him were treated as rebels against the imperial authority. The greatest part of the community being strongly attached to Athanasius, whom they regarded as their spiritual father, while the civil and military authorities, who made no distinction between this business and any other which they were called upon to perform in the name of the emperor, proceeded to enforce obedience to the bishop who had been thrust upon the people, various acts of insurrectionary violence would naturally be the result. The places which had been consecrated to the service of the God of peace were profaned by the rudest passions. Amid these scenes of disorder, the persecuted Athanasius had still time to escape. He repaired, at first, to a place of concealment in the neighbourhood of Alexandria. From this spot, he issued a circular letter to all the bishops, in which he described in strong colours the illegality and injustice of all the proceedings against him. Next, in compliance with an invitation of the bishop Julius, he repaired to Rome. There, by a synod convened near the close of the year 342, he was recognized as a regular bishop, having resided for the space of a year and a half in Rome; and no delegates from the part of the Orientals, who did not acknowledge the tribunal erected by the Roman bishop, having appeared to prove the charges laid against him. The

that of Nicomedia, once the imperial seat of the East Roman empire, and then this bishopric for that of Constantinople. "If you really consider," he writes to them, s. 6, "the dignity of the bishops to be equal; and if, as you write, you do not estimate bishops by the greatness of the cities where they preside, then he to whom a small town has been entrusted should remain in the place to which he was appointed, and neither despise the flock committed to his care, nor pass over to those which have not been entrusted to him; thus despising the honour which God confers on him (I suppose that in this place the word *δόξαι* must have fallen out after *δοξαις*), and betraying a thirst for the vain honour that comes from man."

Roman bishop announced to them this decision in a letter, which was written with the feeling of superiority that springs from the consciousness of right in opposition to illegal, arbitrary will.

All the opponents of Athanasius being looked upon by the Western church as Arians, they were now solicitous to vindicate themselves from this reproach; and many of them, without doubt, as plainly appears indeed from their own avowal, were in no wise devoted to the strictly Arian doctrines; though, at the same time, they were not in favour of the Nicene creed. The hierarchical spirit was expressed in a very remarkable manner, in the introduction to the first confession drawn up at Antioch, where the bishops allege the following as a reason why they could not be called Arians: "How possibly could we, who are bishops, follow the leading of a presbyter?"* Very justly, however, could the majority of them say, that from Arius they had received no new doctrines of faith; but rather, after a previous examination of his faith, had admitted him to church fellowship. At assemblies convened at Antioch in the years 341 and 345, five creeds were drawn up, one after the other. It was agreed to condemn the peculiar Arian formulas, whereby the Son of God was placed in the class of created beings, and whereby a beginning of existence was ascribed to him; and to assert, in the strongest terms, a *similarity* of essence between the Son and the Father. There still remained but two points of difference betwixt the doctrines here expressed by the Eastern bishops and the doctrines of the Nicene council, understood according to their logical connection;—the recognition of the unity of essence, or identity of essence, in contradistinction to resemblance of essence, against which latter conception Athanasius remarked, with great logical acuteness, that it was not applicable to the relation to God at all, but applied only to the relation of temporal and earthly things to each other—and the doctrine of a generation of the Logos having its ground in the divine essence, not conditioned on any single act of the divine will, but rather preceding all individual acts of the divine will.†

* Πῶς ἐπισκοποι ὄντες ἀκολουθήσομεν πρεσβυτέρῳ.

† According to the Athanasian system, the following dilemma necessarily presents itself: either the Logos is placed on an equality with the creatures produced by a particular fiat of the divine will out of nothing, or he is acknowledged to be one with the divine essence, his generation

The Western bishops did not proceed to discuss and compare these confessions of faith, but simply stood fast by the council of Nice. Indeed, they were inclined to consider all the opponents of Athanasius in the East as Arians, and to suspect an Arian element in all their confessions of faith. The difference of languages, moreover, stood in the way of their coming to any mutual understanding; the Greek language not being, at the present time, so generally understood among the people of the West as it had been in former days.

Through the influence of the Roman church, the two emperors, Constantius and Constans, were induced to unite in calling a general council to meet at the city of Sardica in Illyria, in the year 347, for the purpose of deciding these disputed questions, and of healing the breach which now existed between the Eastern and the Western churches. Of the Orientals, comparatively but a few attended; partly, because they took no special interest in the disputes; partly, because they had no desire of joining in common deliberation with clergy of the West; and in part because the distance was inconvenient for them. There were present but seventy-six of the Eastern, and more than three hundred of the Western bishops. Where party interests were so opposite, and the excitement of feelings was so great on both sides, it was impossible to effect an union: the meeting served rather to make the breach still more marked and decided than it was before. The bishops of the West having demanded that Athanasius and his friends should be allowed to attend the assembly as regular bishops, and those of the East having refused to grant this, a total rupture took place between the two parties. The Western bishops continued to hold their session at Sardica; the Orientals drew off to Philippopolis in Thrace. The latter there renewed their sentence of deposition against Athanasius and his friends, and

proceeding from the essence of God, and being as inseparable from it as his holiness, wisdom, etc. All that God wills and decrees, he wills and decrees in the Logos as such. This distinction Athanasius considered necessary, not for the popular exposition of doctrine, but for the systematic exhibition of it. But to the major portion of the Eastern church-teachers these propositions appeared offensive; for, from misconception and want of the gift for speculative apprehension, they were led to suppose that God was thereby subjected to constraint or natural necessity. In the μακροσύνῃς ἐκθίσις; at Antioch, those therefore were expressly condemned who taught: "Ὅτι οὐ βολήσιν οὐδὲ θελήσιν ἐγέννησε τὸν υἱὸν ὁ πατήρ.

extended it also to the Roman bishop Julius; and again composed a new symbol of faith.*

The council of Sardica, on the other hand, confirmed the decisions which had been already made by the Roman synod. A few among the assembled bishops had, moreover, proposed a new confession of faith in opposition to Arianism,† extending not solely to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, but also to the doctrine of his becoming man, and to the relation of the divine and human natures in Christ to each other. But by the wisdom of such men as Athanasius, who did not wish to furnish occasion for new controversies, but only to hold fast the essential thing in the doctrine of Christ's divinity, just as it had been expressed in the Nicene creed, it was so managed that this confession was rejected, and it was declared that the custom of the Arians to multiply and alter confessions of faith should not be followed.‡ The only consequence, for the present, which resulted from this issue of the council of Sardica was, that the bond of fellowship between the two churches was completely severed; but subsequently the council sent delegates for the purpose of recommending to the emperor Constantius the cause of the exiled bishops of the East. Meanwhile, the Western

* According to the report of Socrates, they expressed therein the doctrine of the *ἀνόμιος κατ' οὐσίαν*, therefore the proper Arianism. In this case, we must suppose, that not the Semi-Arians, as in the ecclesiastical assemblies at Antioch, but the proper Arians, here had the preponderance; and that it was not the endeavour here, as it had been there, to lessen the doctrinal differences between the churches of the East and of the West, but rather to express them in the most marked manner. The fact, however, appears otherwise according to the report of Sozomen (3, 11), who, notwithstanding it was his usual practice to follow Socrates, yet in the present case appeals to the synodal letter appended to the confession of faith. By his account this latter seems to have borne a considerable resemblance to the Antiochian symbol, and to have sprung out of the same doctrinal interests: for the Homousion is not mentioned; the anathema is pronounced on those who supposed three gods, or identified Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and also on those who taught that there had been a time when the Son of God did not yet exist. Here then, also, we find nothing, it is true, which the proper Arians might not have subscribed; and perhaps it may have been, that the proper Arian party had in the present case possessed greater influence than they did in the drawing up of the several Antiochian creeds.

† This may be found in Theodoret. I. 8.

‡ Athanasii tomus ad Antiochen. sec. 5. "Ἰνα μὴ πρόσφασις δόξη τοῖς ἐκείνουσι πᾶσι λαοῖς γράφειν καὶ δοῖν περὶ πίστεως."

emperor Constans endeavoured to conciliate his brother to the party of Athanasius. The Oriental court-party ruined their own cause by exposing the mean intrigues of some of their leaders, of whom Constantius himself began to be ashamed; and the ferments among the ever-turbulent people of Alexandria, who were longing after their beloved Athanasius, and who had become still more irritated by the atrocious acts of Gregory; these ferments which finally, in 349, led to the assassination of Gregory, doubtless aroused the political anxieties of the emperor. All these things co-operated to prepare the way for a change in the Eastern church.* Constantius wrote to

* Socrates, Sozomen, and Philostorgius represent the matter as if the emperor Constans had procured the recall of Athanasius, by threatening to bring about his restoration to Alexandria by force of arms. Unquestionably this account is confirmed by certain indications belonging to the time of the council of Sardica, which presuppose such a connection of events. Lucifer of Calaris (Cagliari) says, in his *l. I. pro Athanasio*, c. 35, that if Athanasius were really a heretic, it would be no sufficient excuse for Constantius, that he had been moved to recall him through the fear of being involved in a war with his brother Constans. Again, Athanasius was, at an early period, accused by his enemies of attempting to create enmity between the emperor Constans and his brother Constantius. *Apolog. ad Constant.* s. 3. Theodoret, it is true, mentions also the threats of Constans against his brother, but attributes the change of feeling in that emperor towards the Athanasian party to the fact that Constantius discovered the base intrigues of the worthless Arian bishop, Stephanus of Antioch, against Euphrates, bishop of Cologne. Athanasius, in his *hist. Arianor. ad monachos*, s. 20, 21, simply remarks, that Constans had given to the two bishops who had been sent from the council of Sardica to Constantius a letter of recommendation; but he looks upon it as a consequence of that discovery made at Antioch, that Constantius was brought to his senses. Hence he, in the first place, forbade the persecutions going on against the Athanasians at Alexandria; and then, ten months later, after the assassination of Gregory at Alexandria, recalled Athanasius to that city. Still, however, the silence of Athanasius would prove nothing against the truth of the above-mentioned account; for he would naturally be unwilling to acknowledge a fact which might have served as a confirmation of the suspicion set afloat against himself, that he fomented enmity between the two brothers. It is true, Constantius himself seems to testify, in his first letter to Athanasius, that he had resolved on recalling him at his own motion; and he says, indeed, that it was his intention to write to Constans, with a view to obtain his consent to the proposed recall. But it is plain of itself, that this public declaration of a supreme magistrate meant but little; and since, at all events, even according to the report of Athanasius, it is not to be denied, that Constans had backed the demand of the council for the recall of Athanasius, with his letter of recommendation, the application of Con-

Athanasius, who perhaps could not be so easily induced to place confidence in the emperor's promises, three letters, in which he invited him to return back to his bishopric; and in 349 Athanasius actually returned, and was received by his flock with great demonstrations of joy. But in the same year in which Athanasius came back to Alexandria a political change occurred which was unfavourable to him. He lost his patron, the emperor Constans, who was assassinated by the usurper Magnentius. Now, inasmuch as it was only a combination of circumstances that had co-operated to produce a momentary change, without much foundation for it, in the disposition of Constantius towards Athanasius; as the flatterers of the Arian court-party, favoured by the eunuchs and chamberlains of the palace, ever found it more easy to gain the emperor's ear than Athanasius, whose obstinacy made him an object of suspicion;*—it followed, as a matter of course, that the attacks upon him were soon renewed. Ecclesiastical and political charges were laid against him at once. It was asserted that, for the purpose of deposing bishops who had been accused of some anti-Nicene doctrine, he had stretched his ecclesiastical power beyond all lawful bounds; that he had held divine service on the Easter festival in a large church at Alexandria† before its consecration had been finished by the emperor's command; and, especially, that he had intermeddled with political affairs, in which he had

stantius to his brother for the recall of Athanasius, could be nothing more than a mere formal proceeding. Besides, Constantius, although compelled to take this step, would naturally be unwilling to have it appear that he acted by compulsion. Constantius himself declared, in a document addressed to the Alexandrians after the assassination of Constans, that he had recalled Athanasius to Alexandria out of respect to his deceased brother. *Hist. Arian. ad monachos*, s. 50. But it is not probable that Constans was actually on the point of engaging in a war for this purpose, or that Constantius should have felt so much apprehension from a mere threat of his unwarlike brother; unless we are willing to suppose that the former had to fear the landing of troops by his brother in Alexandria, on account of the exasperated state of feeling which then existed among the people. But it is easy to see, also, that the enemies of Athanasius would take pains to spread the rumour that he had persuaded Constans to threaten war against his brother; and that others would repeat it after them, for the purpose of giving a more brilliant colouring to the zeal of Constans for pure doctrine. The most probable supposition of all is, that different causes were here combined together.

* Ammianus Marcellinus says, *hist. l. XV. c. 7.* Constantio semper festus.

† See above.

no concern, and endeavoured to involve the emperor in a quarrel with his brother Constans.* Various precautionary steps, however, were taken before they ventured to attack directly this important man himself. The first attack was directed against two church-teachers, Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, and Photinus, bishop of Sirmium in Lower Pannonia; of whom the former had, from the beginning, been intimately connected with the Athanasian party. It was easy to fix suspicion on the latter, on account of his intimacy with the first, and thus accuse them both as false teachers.

Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia, had from the first been one of the most zealous defenders of the Nicene Homousion. Being a decided opponent to the theology of Origen's school, he would of course oppose also that system of the Triad derived particularly from the Origenistic scheme of faith which prevailed in the Eastern church. All subordination, which was opposed to the Homousion, appeared to him to be Arianism; and he traced the whole of this to the confusion of Platonic, Hermetic, and Gnostic ideas with Christianity. He declared Origen to be the author of this confusion. But Marcellus, by pushing to the extreme his opposition to Arianism, in a work against the rhetorician Asterius, became suspected himself, as usually happens where opposition is carried to excess, of the contrary error, and of denying as a Monarchian—which he came very near doing—the personal distinctions in the Triad. While the Arians distinguished the Logos dwelling in God from the Logos so called in an improper sense, he maintained, on the other hand, that this very name Logos was the only one which belonged to Christ according to his divine essence. This Logos was to be conceived, either as remaining quiescent, and hidden within the divine essence, as the thinking reason of God, or as that reason proceeding forth into manifestation by means of outward acts,† as in the creation generally, so in the different revelations; particularly and pre-eminently in the highest of all revelations by the Redeemer, when the Logos by virtue of

* Even Amm. Marcellinus was aware that political charges chiefly were brought against Athanasius. *Athanasium ultra professionem altius se offerentem sciscitarique conatum externa.*

† The ἡσυχάζειν and the ἐνέργειν δραστηκὴ ἐνεργεία resembling the earlier distinction between a λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφητικός.

a certain *ἐνεργεία δραστηκή*, assumed a human body as a ministerial organ in accomplishing the redemption of mankind. While the Arians asserted, that the titles applied to the *Λόγος*,—such as the *πρωτότοκος τῆς κτίσεως*, the Son of God, the image of God,—signified a relation of dependence and a beginning of existence; Marcellus admitted they were right in this last particular, but denied the consequence which they believed themselves warranted to draw from this premise in reference to the essence of the *Λόγος* himself. All these predicates he would refer, not to the *Λόγος* per se,—respecting whom, considered alone, the evangelist John predicates only the being in and with God,—but to the particular active efficiency by which the *Λόγος* proceeded forth from God, communicated himself outwardly, and in a special manner to his radiation in human nature.* Christ had called himself distinctively the Son of man, in order to show thereby that he transferred to himself the name Son of God only in reference to the men who, through his irradiation in human nature, were to be made sons of God.†

Marcellus at first had stood in high authority with the adherents of the Nicene council, at which he had zealously contended in behalf of the Homousion. The Arians and Semi-Arians, on the other hand, eagerly took advantage of the weak spots which his exhibition of the Triad exposed to them, for the purpose of accusing him of Sabellianism. At an assembly held by this party at Constantinople in 336, the sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. The business of refuting him was entrusted to Eusebius of Cæsarea, who, as an Origenist, would be a decided opponent of Marcellus. Hence arose the two works of Eusebius against him,‡ which, containing important fragments from the writings of Marcellus, have become the principal sources of our information respecting his doctrines. He found, however, as did also his friends, an affectionate reception in the Western church: the Roman bishop Julius was satisfied with the confession of

* The *γίνεσις τοῦ λόγου* has reference only to the *δραστηκὴ ενεργεία προέρχουσα*. He was the first who referred the passage in Coloss. i. 15, to Jesus, considered as man.

† ἵνα διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης ὁμολογίας θίξῃ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας υἱὸν θεοῦ γίνεσθαι παρασκηύσῃ. Euseb. de ecclesiastica Theol. l. I. c. 20, p. 87. ed. Colon.

‡ C. Marcellum and de ecclesiastica theolog.

faith which he presented to him. He probably, as Athanasius¹ was, in consequence of the decisions of the council of Sardica, restored to his bishopric.

It was assuredly altogether contrary to his knowledge or his will, that Marcellus had approached to the Sabellian or Samosatenian theory, in pushing to the utmost length his favourite doctrine of the Homoeousion; but his disciple Photinus (Φωτεινός), who had received from him the first impulse in his own theological career, did not shrink from plainly expressing the Samosatenian or Sabellian doctrine of the Trinity. Thus, from this quarter, an unfavourable light was reflected on the source whence his doctrines had sprung, the system of Marcellus himself,—a circumstance of which his opponents were not slow to avail themselves.

The renewed attack upon these two men at the synod of Sirmium, in 351, where both were deposed from their places, was the first thing to seal the union of the Anti-Athanasian party,* and to show their power.

In the next place, as there was reason to fear the union of the Western church with Athanasius, advantage was taken of the residence of Constantius in the West, occasioned by the war with Magnentius, to prevail upon the Occidentals, by deceitful representations, and by exciting their fears of the despotic power of Constantius, to whom the Western empire was now subjected, to join with the East in the condemnation of Athanasius. The court-party pretended that the present question did not relate at all to any interest of doctrine, but only to the person of Athanasius. By this statement of the case, many bishops, who had not reflected much upon the matter, might suffer themselves to be persuaded that they could yield what was required without compromising their orthodoxy; that they needed not to sacrifice the quiet of their church to an individual man, who perhaps might in many respects be guilty, whom, at any rate, they could not protect by their single and feeble voices. To the emperor the matter might be so represented, that the bishops who refused to acquiesce in the condemnation would appear to have acted, in an affair having no connection whatever with the system of faith, in disobedience to the imperial commands; to have shown

* Here was drawn up the first *Sirmian* creed, as it was called,—analogous to the fourth Antiochian.

a disposition, in spite of the emperor, to defend his declared enemy ; hence, to be deserving of punishment as refractory and disobedient subjects. Thus was it contrived, at the church assemblies held in Arles and in Milan, to attain by force or by fraud a great number of signatures. Some did not, in truth, really know what was required of them ; the others were bribed by princely favour ; and others were unmanned by their fears, and excused themselves to their consciences by the plea of ignorance.

At such a time, when all that is most sacred was given up and abandoned to the arbitrary will of despotism, it is the more gratifying to observe a few, who, raised by the power of faith above all that human power could offer or threaten, constantly opposed themselves to that arbitrary will ; who, doubtless with clear and calm discernment, saw through the arts of the court-party, which assuredly were aimed, not barely against the person, but also against the doctrines of Athanasius ; and were prepared to devote and to sacrifice everything they had in the defence of truth, of innocence, and of the freedom of a church threatened with the most humiliating slavery. It was not the state, it was only the church, which, in these times of despotism and servility, had such men to show—men inspired with the genuine spirit of freedom, and who never consented to do homage to mere power.

Among these men may be named, particularly, Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli, distinguished for the zeal with which he administered his pastoral office ; also Lucifer of Cagliari, and Hilary of Poitiers. The latter, who was distinguished among the doctrinal writers of the Western church for a profoundness of intellect and a freedom of spirit peculiarly his own, had for many years lived quietly and undisturbed in the administration of his episcopal office, to which he had come about the year 350, without concerning himself about the doctrinal controversies of the East, until the arrival of the emperor in the West, in 355, introduced disquiet also into the Gallic church. Now, for the first time, he heard of the Nicene creed, and found in it the doctrine of the unity of essence in the Father and Son, which he had before this ascertained to be the true doctrine from the study of the New Testament, and had received into his Christian experience, without being aware that the faith which he bore in his heart had been laid

down in the form of a creed.* He now held it to be his duty to sacrifice all else to the confession of the truth. "I might," says he, "have enjoyed all earthly advantages to overflowing, might have boasted of familiar intercourse with the emperor, and, like others abusing the episcopal name, have exercised a dominion in the church intolerable to the community and to individuals, had I only been disposed to falsify the gospel truth, to shield my guilty conscience under the pretext of ignorance, and to excuse a bribed judgment with the plea that it was forced by the judgment of another."† He presented a memorial to the emperor,‡ in which, with the frankness becoming a Christian and a bishop, yet without overstepping the limits of a just respect, he told him many truths worthy of grave reflection, such, doubtless, as in any other way could not have easily come to his ears. He assured him that sedition existed nowhere, as the court-party pretended, in order to excite his alarm; § the Arians were the only ones who disturbed the public peace; there was no other means of healing the evils of the distracted church but by putting an end to constraint in spiritual things, and leaving each one at liberty to live entirely according to the convictions of his own conscience. It was his earnest prayer, he said, that the emperor would graciously be pleased to allow the churches to attend on the preaching of those whom they preferred, whom they themselves had chosen; to receive from such the sacraments, to pray with such for the emperor's welfare and salvation. But, far different from Hilary, Lucifer of Cagliari, a man of stormy vehemence and fanatical zeal, did not understand how to unite to Christian frankness and love of truth that respect for the existing order of the state, and that fulfilment of the duties of the citizen, which Christianity prescribes, and the genuine spirit of Christianity superinduces. True, he spoke in a beautiful and high-minded strain against the unreasonable expectations of the emperor, that the bishops should, at his command, condemn unheard, an absent, and, in their opinion,

* He says of himself, lib. de Synodis, s. 19: *Regeneratus pridem, et in episcopatu aliquantisper manens, fidem Nicenam nunquam nisi exulturus andivi; sed mihi homousii et homœusii intelligentiam evangelia et apostoli intimaverunt.*

† *Opus historicum fragment. I. s. 3.*

‡ *Lib I. ad Constantium.*

§ *Nulla suspicio est seditionis.*

an innocent man; and nobly he calls on the emperor to acknowledge Athanasius as his Christian brother, and as such to forgive him, even though he supposed him guilty of personal offences against himself. On this occasion, too, he said many fine things about the universal Christian brotherhood, which should embrace all without distinction of earthly rank. "Are you ashamed," says he to the emperor, "to call Athanasius your brother? If you profess to belong to Christ, you are bound to call all Christians your brethren, not only Athanasius, but even those whom you see begging an alms of you; for we all, all I mean who belong to the church of the Lord, are one, since with the Lord there is no respect of persons." But with all this, it must be allowed, his intemperate passion blinded him to his obligations of respect to the emperor. He called him an Antichrist, a servant of Satan, and addressed him in a tone which might well be regarded as exciting to sedition, and as tending to confirm the accusations of the Arian court-party. Besides this, Lucifer contended for the independence and freedom of the church, not *in the spirit of the gospel*, which keeps spiritual and worldly things wholly separate from each other, but from another, *unevangelical* point of view; for, mixing together spiritual and secular things in another sense, confounding the theocratic forms of the Old and the New Testaments, he required that the secular power should be outwardly subordinated to the spiritual, that the church should possess the outward sovereignty, and consequently was in favour of setting up a priestly despotism in opposition to that of the emperor.† Finally, the emperor

* Pro Athanasio, l. II. c. 29. Si Christianum te proferis, debes omnes Christianos fratres dicere, et quidem non solum Athanasium, sed et eos quos videris stipem petentes. Omnes enim in ecclesia Domini constituti unum sumus apud quem non sit acceptatio personarum.

† When, for example, he says to the emperor (pro Athanasio, l. I. c. vii.): "So far was he from having any right to rule over the bishops, that he was rather, according to the laws of God, guilty of a crime worthy of death, if in the spirit of pride he refused to obey their decisions." Ut si subvertere eorum decreta tentaveris, si fueris in superbia comprehensus, morte mori jussus sis. Quomodo dicere poteris, judicare te posse de episcopis, quibus nisi obedieris, jam quantum apud Deum, mortis poena fueris mulctatus. Hence, too, in his writings, he quotes from the Old Testament, whence he derived his ideas respecting the church theocracy, more often than he did from the New. We perceive already in Lucifer a spirit of altogether the same cast with that of Hildebrand.

once more used his power to destroy two bishops who stood in high authority,—the one on account of the seat of his episcopacy, the other on account of his venerable age, being more than a hundred years old,—both of whom, he had more cause for sparing than others, the bishops Liberius of Rome, and Hosius of Cordova. Liberius had orally declared, in opposition to the emperor's delegates, to his dogmatizing chamberlains, and to the emperor himself, that nothing should move him to condemn an innocent man, and subject the affairs of the church to the judicial decisions of the emperor. So also Hosius, in a spirited memorial to the emperor, wherein he represented to him that he ruled over his equals, and had one and the same judge with them in heaven. Both, we must admit, acted on the narrow and unevangelical principle, that, as the emperor ruled independently in the secular province, so the bishops ought to rule independently in the spiritual. Liberius was banished to Beræa in Thrace, Hosius to Sirmium. Thus all who refused to obey were banished to different places, for the most part in the East; and many of them were very harshly treated.

When the victory was supposed to be already secured over the Western church, the next step was to attack Athanasius himself, the preëminent object of hatred to the episcopal court-party and to Constantius. But Constantius, purposely, without doubt, sought to lull Athanasius into security, partly that he might have him more certainly in his power, and partly in order to guard against disturbances among the people of Alexandria. When Athanasius first heard of the plots of his opponents, the emperor, in a brief letter, promised him perfect safety, and bade him not be alarmed, and not to allow himself to be disturbed in the quiet administration of his office. When, therefore, the summons requiring him to leave the church was first sent to him by men who professed to have full powers from the emperor, he declared, that, as he had been directed by an imperial writ to remain at Alexandria, he held himself neither bound nor authorized to abandon the church entrusted to him by the Lord, except by a written order coming from the emperor himself, or at least in his name. He quietly proceeded, therefore, to discharge his episcopal duties in the same manner as before; but, while engaged in the church during the night of the 9th of February, A.D. 356,

Amidst a portion of his flock, who were preparing by prayer and song for the public worship, which, according to the Alexandrian usage, was to be celebrated on Friday morning, the Dux Syrianus burst suddenly into the church, with a troop of armed men, regardless of all reverence for sacred things. Athanasius, amidst the din and tumult of the brutal soldiery, perfectly retained his presence of mind: he endeavoured first to preserve peace among the assembled members of his church, and to provide for their safety, before he thought of his own. He remained quietly on his episcopal throne, and bade the deacon proceed in the recitation of the 136th Psalm, where the words "For His mercy endureth for ever," were continually sung by the choir of the church. Meanwhile, however, the soldiers pressed forward continually nearer to the sanctuary. Monks, clergy, and laity, therefore, bade Athanasius save himself; but not until the greatest part of his flock had departed, did he slip out with those that remained, and escape the hands of the soldiers who were sent to arrest him.* Once more, by an armed force, the Alexandrian church were compelled to submit, and receive as their bishop an altogether unclerical, rude, and passionate man, Georgius of Cappadocia. Every sort of atrocity was committed under the name of religion; while Athanasius, threatened with death, and pursued as far as Auxuma in Ethiopia, found refuge among the Egyptian monks.

Thus, then, the Arian party had obtained the victory throughout the whole Roman empire; but this victory was destined to work mischief on themselves. The party was, in fact, composed originally of two constituent portions: those whom we have designated already by the name Semi-Arians, who constituted the majority of the Oriental church, and the Arians properly so called, who formed by far the smaller number. Both parties had been, till now, united by their common opposition to Athanasius and to the council of Nice, and the peculiar differences between themselves had therefore no opportunity for expression; more especially had they whose views were completely Arian a strong interest in attaching themselves to the *dominant* party of the Oriental church. But as the external opposition which had held both parties together

See Athanas. apolog. de fuga sua, s. 24. Hist. Arian. ad monachos, s. 81.

matism of the understanding, Eunomius was led to misconceive, in a remarkable manner, the nature of religion generally, and of Christianity in particular; placing it in an *illumination of the understanding*, in a *theoretical knowledge* of God and divine things. Thus, in opposition to those who defended the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God, he said, "In vain did our Lord call himself the door, if no one enters through this door to the knowledge and contemplation of the Father: in vain did he call himself the way, if he has not made it easy for those who would do so, to come to the Father. How could he be the light, if he did not enlighten men?"* But the gospel speaks of the coming to God, of the enlightening of the soul, in quite another sense from that in which Eunomius here conceives it. A fellowship of *life* with God, and an enlightening of the understanding which comes from this,—not a certain abstract and formal knowledge of divine things, as Eunomius supposes, is the true subject of discourse there. To such an extreme, in fact, did he go in the heat of his polemical zeal, without distinguishing at all *the different forms of knowing*, as to charge those who denied the possibility of knowing God and the generation of the Son of God in the sense in which he conceived it, with denying generally *the objective truth of every possible knowledge of God*. He accused them of preaching *an unknown God*; and, *since without the knowledge of God there could be no Christianity*, he held that, accordingly, they were not even to be called Christians.† The predominant tendency in the church, which, beyond question, may have proved unfavourable to the purity of the Christian doctrines,—the tendency which assigned to the *liturgical* element a so much higher place than to the *didactic* and the *doctrinal*; which exalted the *sacraments* above the *word*,—Eunomius combated; not, however, on purely evangelical, but on other partial principles, placing an over-valuation of the logical development of the doctrinal conception in opposition to the exclusiveness of the tendency above mentioned. The essence of Christianity in his opinion

* Gregor. l. c. 671.

† Μὴδε πρὸς τὴν τῶν Χριστιάνων προσηγορίαν οἰκίως ἔχειν τοὺς ἀγνωστον ἀποφαινομένους τὴν θεῖαν φύσιν, ἀγνωστον δὲ καὶ τὸν τῆς γεννήσεως τρέπον. Gregor. l. c. XI. f. 704.

did not depend on certain sacred names or customs, but on the accuracy of doctrines.*

Gregory of Nyssa maintained, on the contrary, that Christianity proceeded from, and had its root in, the inner life, inward experience, the fellowship of life with Christ; but all this, we must add, depending on the mediation of the visible church, of a visible priesthood, through participation of the sacraments within the church. "We," says he, "have learned from the words of our Lord, that whosoever has not been born of water and of the Spirit, cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven; and that whosoever eats the Lord's body, and drinks his blood, shall live for ever. Even such men as in their inner life are not Christians may nicely argue on the doctrines of the Christian faith; as in fact we hear of those who are not Christians making the doctrines of Christianity a subject for logical disputations." l. c. 704. Had Eunomius and Gregory of Nyssa carried out still further this remarkable difference of views,—which, however, in the vast compass it embraces, was at that time impracticable,—they would have been led back to the question whether the essence of religion consists in a form of knowing, or in a certain species of inward life and feeling; which difference in the mode of conceiving the essence of Christianity, according to the different peculiarities of men's individual characters, according as the heart or the understanding has predominant sway, or at least according as they have been conducted to religion more by the one or by the other of these, is a thing of very frequent occurrence. But when Gregory of Nyssa says it is a peculiarity of paganism to place religion in doctrinal knowledge, this certainly is altogether incorrect; for, on the contrary, the predominant element in paganism was feeling—a feeling neither guided nor accompanied by any clear consciousness, but which confounded God with nature, things divine with things natural. It was not until Christianity had made religion an object of *clear consciousness* that the one-sided tendency could also make its appearance, which placed religion in the *δογμάτων ἀκριβείᾳ* (accuracy of doctrines).

* l. c. 704. Οὐκ ἐν τῇ σεμνότητι τῶν ὀνομάτων, οὔτε ἔθων καὶ μυστικῶ συμβολῶν ἰδιότητά κυροῦσθαι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον, τῇ δὲ τῶν δογμάτων ἀκριβείᾳ.

Eunomius, however, was in nowise conscious of the new doctrinal tendency which would have gone forth from him, in case he had been able to gain preponderance in the church. It was by no means his intention to set up a new doctrinal system. He supposed he was teaching no other doctrines than those contained in the old simple creeds of the Eastern church; he believed that he was only clearly developing the included contents of the doctrine concerning the Son of God transmitted in them. Had it not been for the starting-up of the errors on another side, he was of opinion that men would have been perfectly satisfied with those simple articles which already embraced within them all that was necessary for right knowledge.* It is easy to see, too, how, from his own point of view, he *must* have so considered it, that his doctrines were none other than what necessarily resulted from the development of the ancient doctrines of the church, "concerning the faith in one God, the Almighty Father, from whom proceeded all existence, and the one only begotten Son of God, the God Logos, by whom all things were brought into existence." Is God the Almighty the alone author, himself without beginning, of all existence? Accordingly, then, everything, including the Son of God himself, came into existence from him. A communication from the essence of God cannot be conceived without transferring to the divine being the representations of sense. A production, a bringing forth, cannot be conceived without beginning and end: the generation of the Son of God, which it is impossible to conceive different from any other production, any other work, must have had its beginning, as it must have been completed, at a definite point of time.†

The idea of an eternal generation appeared to the understanding of Eunomius, who could not divest himself of the forms of temporal and sensuous intuition, as a thing altogether

* See Eunomii apologia Basil. opp. ed. Garnier, T. I. f. 619.

† L. c. 650. Πάντε γενήσεως οὐκ ἐστ' ἀπείρον ἐκτιστομένης, ἀλλ' εἰς τι τέλος καταληγούσης ἀνάγκη πάντα καὶ τοὺς παραδιδόμενους τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν γενήσιν τὸ τε (not τότε, as the editions have it) πεπαύσθαι αὐτὸν γινώμενον, μὴδε πρὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπαύστως ἔχειν. He conceived the creating act of God after an altogether anthropopathic, temporal manner. God had instituted the Sabbath for the purpose of showing that his creation, as it had an end, must also have had a beginning: οὐ γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ τῆς γενέσεως ἡμέρᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, ἐν ᾗ κατεπαύσεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων, ἰδὼκε τὴν ὑπομνήσιν τῆς δημιουργίας.

absurd, self-contradictory. This idea of an efficiency flowing out of the essence of God was borrowed, as he supposed, from the pagan philosophy; and this idea had led the *philosophers* also into the false notion of a creation without beginning.

Again, it seemed to Eunomius to follow from the relation above mentioned of the Supreme essence to all things else, that God, who is without beginning, is, by his essential nature, infinitely exalted above all other existences, and also above the Son; and that he can be compared with nothing else. But, by this supposition, he imagined nothing further was determined, as yet, respecting the essence of the Son of God, except in this relation. The difference of created beings among one another depended on the divine will, which had fixed for each being the specific limits of its particular existence; and God had brought forth the Logos alone, the first and the most perfect of created beings, and conferred on him the greatest possible likeness to himself (but, of course, not a likeness of essence), divine dignity and creative power, since it was his will to employ him as his instrument in creating all other existences. This is the ground of the immeasurable difference between him and all other creatures. God produced him alone *immediately*, but all other creatures indirectly through him. In this respect, too, Eunomius believed he could appeal to the agreement of his doctrine with that of the old creed respecting the Logos.

The Arianism which was expressed in this manner would of course bring out in stronger relief the opposition between the Arian and the Semi-Arian parties.

The Antiochian church, over which the Arian Eudoxius presided as bishop, became the gathering place for the adherents of the Arian doctrine, so distinctly expressed by Aëtius and Eunomius. Against these, a violent opposition was excited on the part of the Semi-Arian party; and several of the bishops who stood at the head of it,—such, for example, as Basil, of Ancyra in Galatia—possessed great influence with the emperor Constantius, to whom it was easy to represent the Eunomian doctrines as blasphemous.

At the head of the Arian court-party stood at that time two men, versed in all the intrigues of the court, who had already shown how well they understood the art of changing their principles and convictions according to circumstances, and

particularly according to the prevailing tone of the palace. These were Ursacius bishop of Singidunum in Mœsia, and Valens bishop of Mursa in Pannonia. These persons contrived an artifice, by which for a time they hoped to conceal the differences between the Eunomian party and the ruling majority of the Oriental church, and perhaps by degrees to get entirely rid of the articles of doctrine opposed to that party. It could be plausibly represented to the emperor that all the controversies which for so long a time had distracted the church, had been occasioned by the wretched term *οὐσία*; it was only needful to remove this unhappy term from the vocabulary of the church, and peace would be restored; and the term *οὐσία*, about which there had been so many disputes, did not even once occur in the sacred scriptures in that metaphysical sense; the attempts to define what belonged to the essence of God exceeded, in fact, the limits of the human faculties of knowledge;† and it was possible, indeed, to settle finally in a manner which all must approve everything that was necessary for maintaining the divine dignity of our Saviour, without keeping alive that unholy strife about the *οὐσία*, provided only that due prominence was everywhere given to the resemblance between him and the Father. Such reasons, of course, could easily be represented in a convincing light to the emperor and the followers of the court. It was first at an assembly of the court-party, held at Sirmium in Lower Pan-

* These two men, disciples of Arius, who thus far had been concerned in all the intrigues against Athanasius, presented, when, through the influence of the emperor Constans, the Athanasian party began to conquer, a writing to the Roman bishop Julius, in which they declared all the charges brought against Athanasius to be false, testified their repentance, and pronounced the anathema on the Arian doctrines. See Athanas. apolog. c. Arian, s. 58.

† It is quite evident, that such explanations could not proceed from those who really had at heart the principles of the Eunomian system, or who had not been long since ready to sacrifice them in part to policy. But the latter we are not justified in supposing: for the doctrine concerning the comprehensible nature of the *οὐσία* was, in truth, a thing altogether new, peculiarly Eunomian, wherein, besides, the Arians, properly so called, were not entirely agreed. It may be a question, moreover, whether this new plan of conciliation was not a continuation of the older one which had come from Eusebius of Cæsarea, whether it did not perhaps spring from his disciple and successor, the bishop Acacius of Cæsarea.

nonia in 357, that a symbol of faith was drawn up to this purport: "Whereas so many disturbances have arisen from the distinction of the unity of essence or the likeness of essence (concerning the difference of essence, which the Eunomians maintained, a wise silence was observed), so from henceforth nothing shall be taught or preached respecting the essence of the Son of God, because nothing is to be found on that subject in the holy scriptures, and because it is one which surpasses the measure of the human faculties."* The venerable Hosius, who had passed his hundredth year, and now lived in exile, was wrought upon to subscribe this confession, and was even reported to be its author: thus it was hoped to give it additional weight. Nor was any labour spared to bring over the Roman bishop Liberius. His earnest longing for perfect freedom, and wish to return to his bishopric, finally prevailed on the man who had exhibited so much firmness at first, to abjure his own convictions. He subscribed a creed drawn up by the court-party at Sirmium, which perhaps was none other than that second Sirmian confession.† In a letter to Ursacius and

* Quod vero quosdam aut multos movebat de substantia, quæ Græce *οὐσία* dicitur, id est, ut expressius intelligatur, homocousion aut quod dicitur homocousion, nullam omnino fieri oportere mentionem nec quonquam prædicare; ea tamen causa et ratione, quod nec in divinis scripturis contineatur, et quod super hominis scientiam sit, nec quisquam possit nativitatem ejus enarrare, de quo scriptum est: Generationem ejus quis enarrabit? Jes. LIII. 8. (According to the Alex. vers.)

† That he subscribed a creed drawn up at Sirmium, Liberius himself says in Hilarius, fragm. vi. ex opere historico, s. 6; but the signatures of the bishops to this creed, which Hilary himself notices, do not. it must be admitted, seem to belong to the second Sirmian creed. Yet the conclusion which some, who would fain pass a milder judgment on the conduct of Liberius, have drawn from this circumstance, viz., that he only subscribed the *first* Sirmian creed, of the year 351, which proceeded from the Semi-Arian party, and was extremely moderate (see above)—this is in the highest degree improbable. The then dominant court-party were in fact not looking after authorities to support Semi-Arian creeds; but, on the contrary, their entire efforts were directed to the procuring of influential signatures in favour of their new conciliatory creed. Now, as Liberius, to judge from his way of speaking against his own conscience in the affair of Athanasius, and from the illiberal spirit which betrays itself in his letters to the Eastern bishops, Ursacius and Valens, was surely ready, in this state of feeling, to submit to anything, provided only he could be released from his confinement, and be able to return to Rome; it is impossible to see why the court-party should not have required of him what it must have been most important for them,

Valens, and another to the Oriental bishops at large, he testified his acquiescence in the condemnation of Athanasius; and only begged most earnestly that they would prevail on the emperor to let him speedily return to Rome.

But the leaders of the Semi-Arian party saw in that Sirmian creed a cunningly-contrived device to effect the suppression of *their* peculiar doctrines, and to secure the triumph of the Eunomian. The attempt to unite the contending parties by expunging the disputed articles, and introducing general formulas, became, as usually happens, but the seed of new and still more violent schisms. Two of the most respectable bishops of the Semi-Arian party, Basil of Ancyra and Georgius of Laodicea in Phrygia, published, in conjunction with other bishops assembled in a synod at Ancyra, A.D. 358, a long and copious document of a doctrinal and polemical nature, in which the doctrines of this party concerning the resemblance of essence, as well in opposition to the Nicene as to the Eunomian articles, were fully unfolded; at the same time that the church was warned against the artifices of those who, by expunging the term *οὐσία*, were seeking to suppress the doctrine of the resemblance of essence itself. It was here very clearly shown that true resemblance in all other things presupposed resemblance of essence; and that without this the notion of a Son of God, essentially different from created existences, could not be maintained. The emperor Constantius heard of these controversies. It was contrived to prejudice his mind against several of the leaders of the Eunomian party; so that he who possessed the inclination—no less expensive to the state than it was injurious to the church—of convoking synods,* held it to be necessary once more to convene

to secure. Unless we suppose, then, that Hilary or his scribe committed an error in the title, but one other supposition remains,—which, beyond question, has much in its favour—viz., that the *third* Sirmian creed is here meant. The only difficulty is, that it does not perfectly accord with the testimony of Athanasius, that Liberius spent two years in exile; which statement, however, need not be considered as claiming to be strictly correct in point of chronology.

* The moderate pagan, Ammianus Marcellinus, says of him, l. XXI. c. 16, that, by the multitude of synods which he convened for the purpose of imposing on all his own religious opinions (the bishops travelling at the public expense, and in the public vehicles), he interrupted the business of the public conveyances, *rei vehiculariæ succidisse nervos*; and, in

a general council, at which the bishops of the East and of the West should assist, for the restoration of unity to the church. Such a reunion the leaders of the Arian court-party had much reason to dread; for as it was the case before, that the common opposition to the Nicene Homousion had united together the Arians and the Semi-Arians, so it might easily happen now that the common opposition to strict Arianism would cause the difference between the Semi-Arians of the East and the Homousions of the West to retire into the background; and, in that case, the far inferior strictly Arian party would have to yield to the overwhelming majority of the Orientals and Occidentals belonging to the two parties. The bishops Ursacius and Valens, therefore, employed every art in their power to prevent the assembling of such a general council from the two quarters of the world. As various circumstances came to their aid, they so far actually succeeded as to procure that two councils should be assembled instead of one; an Oriental council to meet at Seleucia in Isuaria, and a Western council to meet at Ariminum (Rimini) in Italy.

Next Ursacius and Valens entered into negotiations with several bishops of the Semi-Arian party, for instance, Basil and Georgius, whom they accidentally met at the emperor's court in Sirmium, respecting a creed which was to be laid before the councils soon to be assembled. This took place in the evening before Pentecost, A.D. 358.* Just as in the case of political compromises, something was sacrificed, and something was conceded on both sides, for the sake of union. To the Semi-Arians it was conceded that the Son of God was before all time and before all conceivable existence generated of God,—which conception was to be apprehended only in a spiritual manner.† It was conceded to them that the Son was in all respects like to the Father, as the scriptures taught. Under this "all," the Semi-Arians might understand the *ὁusia* to be also included; but the Eunomians, looking at the article from their own point of view, instead of finding in the

accordance with this, Hilary says: *Cursus ipse publicus attritus ad nihilum perducitur.* Frag. III. ex opere historico, s. 25.

* Of these transactions Epiphanius speaks, hæres. 73, and moreover gives the date.

† Yet the Eunomians also might admit this, understood in their own way. (See above.)

clause "according to the scriptures," or "as the scriptures teach," a confirmation of that resemblance extending to all respects might, on the contrary, consider themselves warranted so to interpret the clause, as if it contained a limitation of what went before, to wit, in all respects so far as the holy scriptures extended this *all*; and in their opinion God the Father, according to the scripture doctrine, was to be compared, so far as his essence was concerned, with nothing besides himself. To make out this interpretation they may also have availed themselves of the article which the Semi-Arians, making concessions on the other side, allowed to pass, — that the term *οὐσία*, forasmuch as it only served, from not being understood by the laity, to create disturbance, and forasmuch as the holy scriptures did not contain this word, should for the future never be employed in explaining the doctrine concerning God. As this confession of faith was a production of clerical court-policy, so too it renounced altogether the ecclesiastical form in its conclusion, being drawn up in the form of a decree proceeding from the emperor's privy council; and when it was mentioned that this confession had been drawn up in the presence of the emperor, the attribute which pagan flattery had given to the head of the Roman empire—that of the Eternal—was applied to Constantius.* The weak spot here exposed by this court-party, Athanasius well knew how to take advantage of: he said of the Arians that, in affixing with so much precision the date to their confession of faith, a thing that was customary only in political transactions, they let it be known that this was their faith only for this particular moment; and they did not hesitate to give to the emperor Constantius the epithet "Eternal," which they refused to Christ.

The court-party, whose intention was, in the first place, by means of such a creed, to hush up all differences, now disturbed their friends and organs in both the councils; but their artful plots came near being overthrown by the firmness and harmony of the *Homoousians* of the Western, and the *Homœousians* of the Eastern church on the other side. The majority in the two councils which assembled in 359—one at Ariminum, the other at Seleucia—was far too great to be

* 'Επὶ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ δισπότου ἡμῶν τοῦ εὐσεβιστάτου καὶ καλλίνικου βασιλέως.

overreached at once. In both councils there was an unwillingness to have anything to do with the new articles, though they contained nothing heretical, and bore on their front only the love of peace. Those, especially in the Western church, who, owing to their ignorance of the relation of the church pastors to each other, could not penetrate the designs which the authors of such forms had in view, were still full of mistrust, and joined the side of those who understood the real motives. So, by the majority of the council at Rimini, the Nicene creed, and by the majority of the council at Seleucia, the fourth Antiochian creed, were maintained in opposition to all those proposals. But when the court-bishops found that with all their arts they were defeated in the councils themselves, they still endeavoured to carry out their designs in another way, by these low artifices in which they were not to be excelled. The two councils, by the direction of the emperor, were to lay before him their decisions, each sending ten delegates chosen from the body of assembled bishops. The bishops at Rimini had earnestly petitioned the emperor for a speedy decision, in order that they might return to the communities where their presence was needed; but the delegates of the West could not obtain an audience from the emperor, who pretended that he must first dispose of the political business on his hands, so as to have his mind perfectly free to deliberate on sacred things. Under this pretence they were put off from one time to another, and obliged to pass the winter in Adrianople. The bishops meanwhile must quietly remain assembled at Rimini, and leave their communities in the lurch; yet there were several who left without waiting to obtain permission of absence from Constantinople. After the ten bishops had become pretty well weary of journeying from one place to another, and of waiting for the emperor's pleasure, and when they were longing to get back to their country and to their churches, Ursacius and Valens began to urge them with motives, taking advantage of their impatience at any longer residence in the East, as well as of their ignorance of the relation in which the church parties of the East stood to each other. They prevailed upon them at Nicæ, in Thrace, to subscribe their names to a creed which, according to the plan so often mentioned, forbade all propositions respecting the *οὐσία*, as being unscriptural, and merely stated in general that

the Son of God was like the Father, *as the Holy Scriptures taught*. With this creed they repaired to Rimini, and there also, by artful representations and threats, succeeded in carrying through their design with the majority. The happy issue of these proceedings was now used as an argument in treating with the deputies of the Oriental council, who were staying at Constantinople. It was represented to them that the object was at last attained, which had, for so long a time, been sought in vain,—to banish the Nicene creed and the Homousion from the Western church. Such an opportunity ought not to be suffered to pass without advantage; and in the article which set forth a resemblance between the Father and the Son, as the scriptures taught it, everything was in fact contained which they could reasonably require. Besides this, the emperor Constantius, though busily engaged in making preparations for a great festival,* yet took an active part in these transactions. He spent an entire day and most of the night in the council of bishops, sparing no efforts of his own to persuade the delegates to yield. By his authority and influence, which perhaps had more weight than his reasons, it was finally brought about that the deputies of the Oriental council also subscribed a creed similar in all respects to that proposed at Rimini. A council which assembled at Constantinople in 360 re-confirmed this creed. Moreover, Eudoxius, the principal mover of the Eunomian party at Antioch, had succeeded in getting himself made bishop of Constantinople; the bishop Macedonius, who belonged to the Semi-Arian party, and who had made himself unpopular by his violent measures, having been deposed. Eudoxius, who now, as bishop of Constantinople, enjoyed the greatest influence, united his efforts with those of Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, a man whose personal character gave him considerable authority, to bring it about in the first place, that the creed from which the articles concerning the *ousia* were expunged should be everywhere adopted. The emperor Constantius detested as blasphemers those who openly taught and defended the Eunomian doctrines; and as refractory, as the disturbers of good order, and enemies to the peace of the church, those who advocated the Homousion and the Homoiousion. Both parties must inevitably incur his displeasure, if they ventured on a

* In celebration of his entrance into the consular office.

free and open expression of their opinions—if they refused to comply with the humours of the court. The emperor had resolved to put an end to all doctrinal disputes by means of the artificial arrangement above described: deposition and exile, or even a worse fate, threatened the bishops who refused to acquiesce. Eudoxius himself must consent to desert his favourite Aëtius of Antioch, who had become offensive to the emperor by too open a display of his Arian logic. Eudoxius had procured for Eunomius the bishopric of Cyzicus; but he advised him to accommodate himself to the times. Eunomius, however, neglected to follow this counsel of a prudent church policy; and, having openly taught his doctrines, was complained of to the emperor, who manifested the warmest displeasure. His friend Eudoxius, who told him that he must ascribe this misfortune to the neglect of his own good advice, warned him of the persecution which lay in store for him, and he fled. He now became the leader of the party which went by his name, the other important members of it being governed more by political than by doctrinal motives. If the dominion of that party which procured the adoption of the creed of Nicæ and Rimini could have lasted longer, still it would have been hardly possible for the two contending parties to continue holding this undefined and neutral position. The strict Arian or Eunomian party would doubtless have at length taken advantage of the expunging of the articles relating to the *οὐσία*, to make their own openly expressed doctrines the dominant creed of the church; as, in fact, an attempt of this sort had already been made at Antioch, which was only suppressed through fear of the emperor.*

This artificial union created in many churches the utmost confusion. Many, who really agreed with each other in their system of faith, were in this way separated by misunderstandings: for many, who out of weakness or ignorance of the relations of the contending doctrinal parties to one another, had subscribed the creed which left out the articles respecting the *οὐσία*, were now regarded by the zealots of their own party as apostates, as betrayers of the true doctrine, as Arians. They seemed to stand in church fellowship with those who, in their system of faith, were not one with them; and by those who should have borne with them as brethren weak in the faith,

* Sozom. l. IV. c. 29.

brethren erring through ignorance, they were treated with hostility, as false teachers.

But an arrangement which had been carried through by outward force, and imposed on the church by arbitrary human will, in defiance of her own natural course of development, could have no substantial basis, but must dissolve of itself as soon as the outward force was removed from which the whole had proceeded. With the death of the emperor Constantius everything took an entirely different direction, and under the reign of the pagan emperor, his successor, who gave equal liberty to all the Christian parties, the relations of these parties to each other, after throwing off what had been imposed upon them, could proceed to shape themselves after a manner conformed to the actual course of church development. The party attached to the Homoousion were prepared to derive the greatest advantage from their former oppressions, and from the period of freedom which now followed; for many had, in fact, been estranged from it merely by force or by misunderstanding, and these were now willing to break loose again from their connection with the Arian party, and unite themselves with those to whom they had always remained bound by the ties of faith. In the next place, Semi-Arianism was well suited to form a transition-point to the more consistent system of the Homoousion; and the collision into which Semi-Arianism had fallen with Eunomianism would naturally tend to promote this transition. But the persecutions which the zealous professors of the Homoousion had been obliged to undergo might easily engender a repulsive fanaticism, which would tend to multiply divisions and misunderstandings, as we see in the case of Lucifer of Cagliari. The great Athanasius, however, was not less distinguished for his prudence and moderation in the time of peace than he had been for his firmness and consistency in the season of conflict; and through his influence, which was supported by that of others of like temper, such as Eusebius of Vercelli, this danger was averted from the church.

Several of the bishops, on their way home from their banishment in different countries, met together under the presidency of Athanasius at Alexandria. Here it was resolved to do all that was possible in the way of meeting those who were desirous of uniting once more with the orthodox church.

Those who, under the preceding government, had, through weakness, allowed themselves to be hurried into fellowship with the Arian party, might without any further steps be acknowledged and received as members of the Catholic church, and be retained in the same offices which they had hitherto filled in their respective communities.* To those only who had been among the *leaders* of the Arian party this privilege was not conceded, but yet they might be received as members of the Catholic church on renouncing their spiritual offices. This ecclesiastical body expressed its views in a noble spirit of Christian charity: "We wish all who still stand aloof from us, and who seem to have united with the Arians, would give up their delusion, so that all in every place might say, 'One Lord, one faith;'—for what is so glorious and lovely as that, in the words of the sweet singer, brethren should dwell together in unity? (Ps. cxxxiii. 1) for so we believe the Lord also will dwell with us according to his promise, 'I will dwell in them, and walk with them.'" Divisions also, which had arisen from disputes about words, it was attempted to heal by coming to a mutual understanding respecting the conception denoted by the words. In respect to one schism alone, which had arisen in the Antiochian church, but where, in like manner, there was no real difference of doctrinal views at bottom, this aim was frustrated, through the want of impartiality; and so the germ was nourished, of a long-continued, and in its consequences, important schism, of which we must now speak in brief.

The beginning of this schism is to be traced back to a much earlier period. About the year 330, the already mentioned Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, had been deposed from his office by the Anti-Nicene party; but a majority of the community remained faithfully attached to him. They refused to acknowledge as their bishops the Arians who were thrust upon them, and formed a separate church party under the name of Eustathians. When, in 360, the Arian bishop Eudoxius re-

* It was thought that indulgence could the more properly be employed in this case, inasmuch as several of the bishops had yielded only in form, in order to retain possession of their churches, and preserve these from the infection of Arianism, which would otherwise have been spread through them by Arian bishops placed over them by force; as Aaron yielded for the moment to the Jewish people, in order to keep them from returning back to Egypt and falling irrecoverably into idolatry. See Athanas. epist. ad Rufinianum.

signed the bishopric of Antioch to become bishop of the imperial city of the East Roman empire, Meletius, then bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, was, after a long contest, chosen his successor. Meletius was attached to the Nicene doctrine, or at least inclined that way, but he did not belong to the zealots who made the essence of Christianity to consist in this or that formula of belief, and who in their sermons treated of nothing else than the current doctrinal questions of the day.* It is probable that, without entering into controversies of doctrine, he presented in his discourses the gospel truths in the way best suited to the wants of his flock. The Arians, who could not understand the spirit of such a man, interpreted this moderation as a proof of his agreement with their own doctrines, or at least supposed they might reckon, that if he had hitherto appeared neutral, he would now, out of gratitude for so important a bishopric, openly preach Arianism in his sermons: but they found themselves mistaken.

Meletius preached an inaugural discourse in 361,† characterized by a spirit of Christian moderation entirely free from the fear of man. His starting point was, that fellowship with Christ‡ is the foundation of the whole Christian life; that he only who has the Son, can have the Father also. "But we shall continue," said he, "in fellowship with the Son and with the Father, when before God and the elect angels, nay, also before *kings*, we *confess* him, and are not ashamed of our confession." This brought him to lay down his own confession of faith concerning the Son in decided opposition to strict Arianism, yet in so moderate expressions, that even Semi-Arians could have nothing to find fault with, as he did not touch upon the disputed Homousion. Perhaps Meletius belonged to the class who, like many of the Orientals, had gradually gone over from the moderate Semi-Arianism which we find in a

* Thus, doubtless, sermons were often preached, which were entirely barren of profit to the hearers. An example of bad taste, carried to a singular extreme, is given in the case of a discourse preached by an Arian at Antioch. Hilar. c. Constant. s. 13. The point was, that God, in the proper sense, could not have a son; for if he had a son, he must also have had a wife with whom he could live and have intercourse; and so on after the same absurd and irreverent manner, little to the edification of his flock.

† Preserved in Epiphanius. hæres. 73. Galland. t. V.

‡ The *Χριστὸν ἔχειν ἐν αὐτῷ*.

Cyrill of Jerusalem, to the doctrines of the Nicene council. He purposely took care not to give way too much to the doctrinal tendency of his hearers, not to venture upon too nice distinctions ; and for this reason he even rebuked the speculative pride which affected to know and determine too much concerning these incomprehensible things. He reminded them of the apostle's words that human knowledge was but in part, and that perfect knowledge was to be expected only in the life to come.

When the Arians saw they had been deceived in their expectations from Meletius, they deposed and banished him, after he had been in the active duties of his office scarcely a month. Now the friends of Eustathius, who in the meantime had died, instead of attaching themselves to Meletius, as they ought to have done, since he agreed with them in doctrine, had contracted a prejudice against him, and suspected him because he had been instituted bishop by the Arian party, and perhaps also because, as he did not belong to the number of blind zealots, he appeared to them not sufficiently decided. Hence they did not acknowledge him as bishop, and remained a separate party under the presbyter Paulinus, who had already for a long time conducted their public worship. The document of the Alexandrian council was now sent separately to the flock of Paulinus. This community was invited, with all love, to receive those of the other party who were willing to unite with them, dismissing controversies on unessential matters and verbal disputes, which hindered union ; but no mention was made of Meletius. All this plainly showed that only the church of Paulinus was acknowledged to be in the right, and that there was no inclination to recognize Meletius. In addition to this, Lucifer of Cagliari was sent to hush the disputes, a man the least of all fitted to be a mediator of peace. It was wholly in character with his ignorant zeal that he should pronounce Meletius an Arian, and give a head to the opposite party, by ordaining Paulinus as their bishop. Thus was laid the foundation of a schism which was propagated for a long time, and which, on account of the general sympathy of the other churches, came to have important consequences : for the Western and the Alexandrian churches declared in favour of Paulinus ; the Oriental church, for the most part, in favour of Meletius.

The same Lucifer, who gave to the Antiochian schism a

duration which, without his interference, it perhaps never would have had, proceeded, in this same spirit of ignorant zeal, to lay the beginnings of another important schism. The moderation which reigned in the decisions of the Alexandrian council could not, of course, be very pleasing to a man of his character. He was for receiving no one who had been connected with the Arian party, so long as he retained his office; and, as he believed that the catholic church was defiled by the re-admission of unworthy ecclesiastics, he became the founder of a separate party, the Luciferites, who regarded themselves as constituting the only pure church.

Under the reign of the emperor Jovian, the relation of the parties to each other continued, in the main, to be the same; for although this emperor espoused the Nicene doctrine, yet it was his principle (see above) never to interfere, by his political power, either in the affairs of religion generally, or in the internal concerns of the church in particular. The same principle was followed by his successor, the emperor Valentinian; but his brother Valens, to whose hands he had entrusted the government of the East, being a pupil of the bishop Eudoxius, from whom he had received baptism, was a zealous Arian, and as by natural disposition he was inclined to harsh, cruel, and despotic measures, he allowed himself to be used as a tool of the fanaticism and of the ambitious designs of the Arian clergy. Then followed a period of most deplorable desolation in many of the Oriental churches. Worthy bishops were persecuted and driven away; worthless men, who had their friends and patrons among the imperial eunuchs and chamberlains, were imposed on the churches as clergymen and bishops. Still, however, this persecution turned out to be rather favourable than prejudicial to the interest of the Nicene party, for the Semi-Arians were driven more and more, by the persecutions which they had to suffer from the dominant Arian party, to the party of the Homoeousians. It was only by uniting with the last party, now dominant in the West, that they could expect to obtain help in their oppressed situation. Aversion to the strictly Arian party, the wish to be united with the party which in many quarters offered them the hand, and which could afford them the most powerful assistance,—all this led many among the Semi-Arians to measure the difference which separated the two parties by another

standard than that which they had hitherto applied. They explained to themselves the Homœousion at first in their own sense, just as many had already done at the Nicene council, but with this difference, that the approximation was then the effect of outward constraint, while at bottom there was an earnest desire that this compulsory union might be dissolved; but here, on the contrary, the approximation grew out of inward inclination. Add to this, that all that was distinguished on the side of science and intellect inclined to the doctrine of the Homœousion; and that this party accordingly, which must finally prevail on account of the consistency of their system, obtained also increasing consequence by the superiority of the character and talents enlisted on its side.

It was especially the three great church teachers of Cappadocia, Basil of Cæsarea, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory of Nazianzen, who, with the like prudent zeal, guided by freedom of spirit and moderation of temper, contributed to procure the victory for the Nicene doctrines in the Oriental church. The labours of Basil fall more particularly within the period of the reign of Valens. Not only by his energy and firmness, but also by his high standing in the opinion of the people, he offered a successful resistance to the tyranny of Valens; and by his means the entire province of Cappadocia was preserved from those desolations occasioned by the influence of arbitrary will, which befel other provinces of the East. The emperor Valens, when he visited Cæsarea, was for compelling him to receive his Arians into the fellowship of the church. The Tpræfect Modestus sent for him, and, on the principles of the Roman state religion, demanded whether he alone, when all others obeyed the emperor, dared to wish to have any other religion than that of his master.* Basil replied that he had nothing to be afraid of; possessions, of which men might deprive him, he had none, except his few books and his cloak. An exile was no exile for him, since he knew that the whole earth is the Lord's. If torture was threatened, his feeble body would yield to the first blows, and death would bring him nearer to his God, after whom he longed. Valens himself was constrained to show respect for Basil. Many times he was on the point of condemning him to exile,† but he did not venture on that step. In general the

* 'Οτι μὴ τὰ βασιλείως θρησκείαις.

† Gregor. Naz. orat. 20.

great love and the great consideration in which many of the bishops stood with the people was a means of security to their churches. The ardent desire of the people of Alexandria for Athanasius, who, for a wise purpose, had for some months withdrawn himself, induced the emperor Valens, from the apprehension of a tumult, to recall him ; and Athanasius enjoyed in the last years of his toilsome and stormy life, until 373, the quiet which had before been denied him.

By Basil's freedom of spirit and moderation the union also was promoted between the divided church parties—the union of the Western and Eastern churches, which had been thrown into still more violent hostility to each other in consequence of the Antiochian schism ; and he would have accomplished still more, had he been able to overcome the pride and obstinacy of the Roman bishops. The alliance between the East and the West had, however, the effect, at last, of inducing the emperor Valentinian, in conjunction with his brother, to publish an edict, in the year 375, in which they protested against those by whom the name and power of the princes were wrongly made use of in persecutions under pretext of religion.

The victory of the party attached to the Nicene council, the way for which had been prepared by the free development of the church doctrine out of itself, was fully established externally also under the emperor Theodosius the Great. Already, by a law of the year 380, he directed that only those who agreed with the bishops, Peter of Alexandria or Damasus of Rome, in their system of faith—that is, who were in favour of the Nicene doctrine concerning the identity of essence—should remain in possession of the churches ; and this law the emperor sought gradually to carry into execution. When, in the month of November of this year, he made his triumphal entry into Constantinople, the Anti-Nicene party was there dominant, as it had been for forty years. There was one individual who had been engaged for two years in collecting together, and continually making additions to, the bereaved, scattered community of those who, in the midst of the reigning Arian party, professed the Nicene doctrine. This was the before-mentioned Gregory of Nazianzus, whose whole life took a character of instability from oscillating between the contemplative bent and practical activity in the discharge of official duties. As he had often already withdrawn from the contemplative life to

embark in ecclesiastical affairs; and then, without due regard to propriety, had deserted his post and retired again to the life of seclusion; so now he had finally withdrawn from the pressure of affairs, from the administration of the bishopric left vacant by the death of his father at Nazianzen, to a retreat near Seleucia in Isauria. It then came about that he must be called from this quiet seclusion to an unquiet public life of conflict and trial. He was summoned to preside over that small and forsaken community consisting of the oppressed adherents to the Nicene doctrine in Constantinople. Renouncing once more the contemplative life, he undertook this mission, partly because he deemed himself bound not to let the opportunity pass unimproved, of effecting so much for the victory of pure doctrine as might be accomplished at Constantinople; in part also, perhaps, because the prospect of entering upon so wide and splendid a field of labour as might be opened for him at Constantinople had more attractions for a man who was not wholly free from vanity, than the narrow field at Nazianzen. As, in large cities, splendid gifts of oratory were in no small request, Gregory might, by that means, effect much for the spread of the Nicene doctrine at Constantinople. Far-famed are the five discourses which he preached there in defence of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity against the objections of the Eunomians, and which gained for him the surname of *the Theologian*.* By the way in which he distinguished himself from other impatient, violent bishops, who abandoned themselves to the impulses of a passionate zeal—by uniting moderation with zeal for pure doctrine—by shaming his passionate and fanatical enemies through his own gentleness and forbearance, he might doubtless effect more than by his eloquence. It is also the merit of Gregory, that he did not, like other church-teachers of this period who had been drawn into the field of controversy, forget, in his zeal for those views of doctrine which he had found to be correct, that the essence of Christianity does not consist in speculative notions, but in the life; that he did not suffer himself to be misled by an exclusive zeal for orthodoxy of conceptions, to neglect practical Christianity. Much rather did he make it a matter of special

* Ὁ Θεολόγος, because Θεολογία, in the stricter sense, was the term applied to the doctrine of Christ's divinity, as contradistinguished from οἰκονομία, the doctrine of his incarnation.

concern to combat that exclusively prevailing tendency to speculation in religion, which tended to the injury of a living, active Christianity—a tendency which was so very agreeable to the mass of worldly men, because it made it easy for them to put on the appearance of zeal for piety and orthodoxy, and to deceive the judgment of others, and in part also their own conscience, while they spared themselves from the contest with sin in their own hearts and in the world without them. He often declared strongly against the delusive notion, that all manner of frivolity might be united with zeal for sound doctrine, and often presented before his hearers, with pointed earnestness, the truth that, without a holy sense of divine things, men could have no understanding of them; that sacred matters must be treated in a sacred manner. He often spoke against the perverse manner of those who looked upon discussions on divine things as any other conversation * on topics of ordinary discourse, and often declared to them, that the full and perfect knowledge of divine things was not the end of the present earthly life, but that its end was, “by becoming holy, to become capable of the full intuition in the life eternal.” Gregory at first held the meetings of his church in the hall of a private house belonging to a kinsman of his. This being the spot whence the triumph of the Nicene doctrine at Constantinople began, the private place of assembly was subsequently converted into a large church, which, in commemoration of the resurrection of the pure doctrine there commenced, received the name of *Anastasia*.

Thus the emperor Theodosius, on his entering into Constantinople, found the community whose faith he acknowledged as his own, with its bishop, Gregory, not even in possession of a church, but assembled in one corner of the city in a private house, while the Arian bishop Demophilus was in possession of all the churches. The emperor left it to the latter's choice, either to subscribe to the Nicene creed, or to give up the churches. Demophilus was not a man who regarded the favour of princes and earthly prosperity as of more account than the interests of religion and of the truth. He chose to do the latter; and the Arians, from this time onward, were obliged to hold their assemblies at Constantinople without the

* “Ὁσιος τὰ ἱερικά καὶ τὰ διὰ τὴν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ διὰ παύσιν.

city walls, which they continued to do until into the sixth century.

Gregory was then conducted by the emperor, surrounded by his nobles and the imperial body guard, which was necessary to protect him from the insults of the fanatical multitude still devoted to Arianism, into the cathedral. The heavens were overclouded and dark when this took place, which was interpreted by the superstition of the bigoted zealots as a token of the divine anger: but, as the clouds scattered, and the sun broke through, this delusion was refuted, and a favourable impression produced. The emperor now resolved to assemble a second general council in the capital of the East Roman empire which should settle the hitherto disputed questions, seal the triumph of the Nicene doctrine, and at the same time solemnly inaugurate the new patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzen, according to the original plan. In the beginning, when for the most part none but Asiatic bishops were present at the council, Meletius, bishop of Antioch, venerable on account of his great age and his opposition to the Arian doctrines, stood at the head of the assembled body, and by him Gregory of Nazianzen was consecrated bishop of Constantinople. Meletius soon after died; and Gregory came in possession of the highest authority, which, moreover, his new position, as patriarch of the second capital of the world, would give him.

To Gregory had been bequeathed, by his friend Basil, the favourite plan of bringing about, between the two great portions of the church, a restoration of the peace which had been disturbed, especially by the Antiochian schism. The death of Meletius, during the session of the council, furnished a favourable opportunity for effecting this object. Paulinus, too, was very old; and if no successor was chosen to Meletius, the steps probably might soon be taken for a new choice, in which both the parties could unite, and the schism would be brought to an end. Gregory used every possible argument to persuade the other Oriental bishops, although, as the friend of Meletius, he might be more prejudiced than others on this side; but his arguments were defeated by the ambition and obstinacy of many, who would yield none of their rights, and who chose the bishop Flavianus as Meletius's successor. Thus a new prop was given to the schism, which continued to propagate

itself till the beginning of the fifth century, although the influence of the Eustathian party was ever on the wane. The manner in which this division was at last wholly removed, stood in direct contrast to the manner in which it had been elicited and maintained—evincing how, in matters of this sort, the advances of love will accomplish vastly more than all force and all arguments of persuasion. The venerable bishop, Alexander of Antioch, on a festival day, conducted his whole flock, clergy and laity, to the church where the Eustathians held their assemblies. All united together in prayer and song; even the crowd, who, as the church was insufficient to contain them, stood assembled in the streets. Devotion and brotherly love met together, all hearts were one, a feast of charity was celebrated, and the division was thought of no longer.*

To return to the point from which we digressed: Gregory, disgusted at seeing his colleagues sacrifice in this way the good of the church to their private passions, withdrew himself entirely from public transactions, vitiated by so many impure motives. When afterwards the Egyptian and the Western bishops arrived, who belonged to the Anti-Meletian party, they took no pains to conceal the dissatisfaction which they felt at the appointment of Gregory as patriarch of Constantinople, because Gregory was a friend of Meletius, and had been ordained by him; and for various other reasons. They could bring at least an apparent argument, on grounds of justice, against the validity of Gregory's appointment—namely, that he had, at all events, been earlier instituted and regarded as bishop over another community (either at Nazianzen or at Sasina), and therefore, according to the laws of the church, could not be transferred to another bishopric;—an ecclesiastical rule, which, it must be owned, was often enough transgressed in the East, without any such weighty reasons as might be urged in the present case, and which assuredly, when appealed to, must have served, on the part of the Orientals, as a cover for other motives. The bishops of the Roman church, which was more strict in its observance of this law, may have been more sincere in appealing to it; but Gregory of Nazianzus had no desire to enter into a profane quarrel about a splendid church office. He requested the emperor

* Theodoret. V. 35.

and the bishops that he might be allowed to resign this office, since he would very readily, like Jonah, sacrifice himself for the ship of the church; although this request perhaps was not designed in the first place to be so seriously taken. His petition being at once universally accepted,—which perhaps, being what he had not expected, chagrined him, he delivered, before the assembled council of a hundred and fifty bishops, a farewell discourse, in which he dealt out many a hard truth against the worldly-minded bishops. Gregory of Nyssa seems now, by the superiority of his well-trained intellect, to have acquired special influence over the doctrinal transactions of the council. The result of it was precisely what the preceding struggles had been preparing the way for, that the Nicene creed, which before had been *forced* on the Oriental church, and therefore repelled by it, was now voluntarily adopted by a great majority of that church, where it found a more general welcome. In the provincial cities, where the dogmatizing spirit was not so prevalent, the transition from Arianism to the Nicene doctrine often took place in a very imperceptible manner. For when the people heard Christ called from the pulpits, “God and the Son of God, the begotten before all time,” they were led by their Christian feelings to place in these words more than was meant by the Arian preachers, according to their own connection of ideas, into which the people did not enter; and so Hilary remarked, that “the ears of the audience were more pious than the hearts of the preachers.” Accordingly, when Homœousian preachers took the place of the Arians, the people remarked no very great change.*

The Nicene creed, in the new form in which it was here made known, departed but slightly from the original one. The most important change was an addition to the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, which was brought about by the farther progress in the development of the church system; which leads us now to throw a glance on the history of this doctrine, the determination of which belonged with the rest

* Hilarius Pictav. c. Auxentium liber s. 6. Hoc putant illi fidei esse, quod vocis est. Audiunt Deum Christum, putant esse, quod dicitur. Audiunt Filium Dei, putant in Dei nativitate inesse Dei veritatem. Audiunt ante tempora, putant id ipsum ante tempora esse, quod semper est. Sanctiores aures plebis, quam corda sunt sacerdotum.

to the complete and established form of the doctrine of the Trinity.

As it concerns the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, a much longer time transpired before the idea of the unity of essence was consistently carried out in its application to this part also of the Christian consciousness of God. The system of subordination would of course extend itself also, after the due measure and proportion, to this doctrine; as was apparent in the church-teachers of the preceding period. The views of Origen on this point also were the prevailing ones in the system of the Eastern church, until they were suppressed by the consistent development and the triumph of the doctrine concerning the Homoeousion. It is remarkable, that, at the Nicene council, the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit was expressed only in very vague and general terms. Yet the opposition to Arius ought naturally to have led to a more exact determination here; for, while Arius regarded the Holy Spirit as being the first created nature produced by the Son of God, he placed the same distance betwixt the Son and the Holy Spirit which he had supposed between the Father and the Son.* But this point possessed as yet no very great interest in doctrinal polemics; and many who saw their way clear to subscribe to the Homoeousion as it respected the Son of God, would have scrupled to extend this same determination also to the Holy Spirit. The unity of the Christian consciousness of God had here so little permeated as yet the apprehension of the idea, that Gregory of Nazianzen could still say, in the year 380: "Some of our theologians consider the Holy Spirit to be a certain mode of the divine agency (as, for instance, Lactantius had done in the preceding period); others, a creature of God; others, God himself. Others say, they do not know themselves which of the two opinions they ought to adopt, out of reverence for the holy scriptures, which have not clearly explained this point." Hilary of Poitiers held it best to remain fast by the simple scripture doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, which, as it seemed to him, furnished no materials for exact logical definitions of this doctrine. He believed that he found in the sacred scriptures no such exact definitions concerning the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Father, as he found concerning of the relation of the Son. He supposed that

* See Athanas. orat. I. c. Arian. s. 6.

he found the name God nowhere used expressly of the Holy Spirit, and he did not venture therefore expressly so to name him; but yet a great deal seemed to him to be already implied, when the Holy Spirit is called in scripture the Spirit of God, and it is said of him that he searches the deep things of God. He was well aware, as he expresses it, in his own original way, that nothing could be foreign from God's essence which penetrates into its depths.* "Should one ask us," says he, "what is the Holy Spirit, and we knew of nothing further to reply than that he exists by and from Him by whom and from whom are all things; that he is the Spirit of God, but also God's gift to believers; and this answer displeased him, then might the apostles and prophets also displease him; for they affirm only this of him, that he *exists*."†

The system of Eunomius discovers itself on this point also to be a dead, narrow theory, which had by no means sprung from the depth of the inner Christian life. The Holy Spirit, according to Eunomius, is the first among the created natures, formed according to the command of the Father, by the agency of the Son; which Spirit, as being the first after the Son, has received indeed the power to sanctify and to teach, but wants the divine and creative power. But yet how could the power to sanctify, to enlighten, be rightly conceived, unless it was referred back to the divine fellowship of life of which the redeemed are made partakers? And how could this be held fast, if men separated the power to sanctify and to teach from the essence of God, and from the power of creating? We perceive here an arbitrary severance of conceptions, which is in contradiction with the unity of the Christian life. But this unity was, in opposition to Arianism, from the first everywhere foremost in the systematically consistent Athanasius. He was led, particularly and expressly, to unfold this doctrine, because many of the Semi-Arians were on the point of adopting the Homousion, explaining it to themselves according to their own meaning, but without being able to make up their minds to apply this determination to the Holy Spirit. The latter appeared to them a being created by the Son, as an instrument for carrying into effect the divine purposes; a ministering

* De Trinitate l. XII. c. 55. In an address to God: Nulla te, nisi res tua, penetrat; nec profundum majestatis tuæ, peregrinæ atque alienæ a te virtutis causa metitur.

† L. II. de Trinitate, s. 29.

spirit, like the angels. In opposition to these, Athanasius sought to show that Arianism could be consistently renounced only when men acknowledged in the Triad nothing foreign to God's own essence; when men acknowledged but *one* essence agreeing with itself—self-identical. He adduces in proof of the divinity and identity of essence of the Holy Spirit, the testimony of the Holy Spirit and the witness of the universal Christian consciousness, unfolding what is contained in both these testimonies: “How could that *which is sanctified by nothing out of itself*, which is itself *the source of sanctification* for all created natures, be of the same essence with *that* which is sanctified by it? In the Holy Spirit we receive fellowship with God, participation in one divine life; but this could not be so if the Holy Spirit were a creature. As certainly as we are by him made partakers of the divine nature, so certainly must he himself be one with the divine essence.* As he who has seen the Son sees the Father, so he who *has the Son has also the Holy Spirit*; and he who has the Holy Spirit has also the Son, and is a temple of God. As the Son, being in the Father, and the Father being in him, cannot be a creature, so neither can the Holy Spirit, being in the Son, and the Son being in him, be a creature.† From this time forward, the identity of the essence of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son was maintained by the most eminent teachers of the Oriental church, by such men as Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, Amphilochius, and Didymus; and at length this doctrine also passed over into the synodal articles. After the Alexandrian council, already mentioned, and an Illyrian one of the year 375 ‡ had set the example in this matter, the extension of the *ὁμοούσιον* to the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit was adopted also into the new form which the Nicene creed received through the second general council at Constantinople. The Holy Spirit was described by this Nicene-Constantinopolitan creed, in the scriptural phraseology, as “the Spirit proceeding from the Father; the governing, quickening Spirit, who is to be worshipped

* Ep. I. ad Serapion, sect. 24. Εἰ δὲ Θεοποίη, οὐκ ἀμφίβολον, ὅτι ἡ ταυτοῦ φύσις Θεοῦ ἔστι.

† See Athanas. ep. I. III. IV. to the bishop Serapion of Thmuis.

‡ Which was the first to extend the *ὁμοούσιον* to the doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit.

and honoured at the same time with the Father and the Son.”*

On the first clause of this formula there arose, in later times, a difference of view between the two portions of the church, the Eastern and the Western, the germ of which we discover even in the present period.

In the Eastern church it was according to the prevailing view to consider God the Father as being “the sole efficient cause (*causa efficiens*) of all existence; the Logos as being the revealing and mediatory principle; and the Holy Ghost as being the completive divine principle in the creation. God the Father effected all through the Son in the Holy Spirit.”† As connected also with this view of the matter in the Oriental church, the unity of the divine essence rested upon this as its basis, that God the Father should be acknowledged as “the sole efficient cause (the *μία ἀρχή*) from whom all else was derived, from whom the Son was generated, and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeded, and who effects all through the Son and in the Holy Spirit.” This formula, so connected with the views of the Oriental church that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, “was made especially prominent and held fast in opposition to the doctrine of *the creation of the Spirit*—that the Holy Spirit is not related, after the same manner as the Son, to the essence of God, but is a creature of the Son.” The opposite to this doctrine was expressed as follows,—“that the Holy Spirit does not derive his essence

* Τὸ κυρίον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύον, σὺν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον.

† Athanas. c. Serapion. l. i. c. 24. The Father creates and renews all through his Logos in the Holy Spirit. Basil. Cæsar. de Sp. S. c. 16. By the will of the Father all spirits have received their existence, by the agency of the Son they were brought into existence, by the presence of the Holy Spirit they are completed in their existence. There are not *τρεῖς ἀρχαί*, but *μία ἀρχή*, δημιουργοῦσα δι’ υἱοῦ καὶ τελιοῦσα ἐν πνεύματι. Gregory of Nyssa, T. III. de baptismo Christi, represents the Father as the *ἀρχή*, the Son as the *δημιουργός*, the πνεῦμα as the *τελειωτικὸν τῶν πάντων*. Basil of Cæsarea endeavours, in his 38th letter, to show how it is necessary, from the operations of God in man, one should mount, step by step, to the idea of the Trinity. All good which is wrought in us by the power of God, we recognize as the operation of the Holy Spirit. From this we pass to the idea of the author of all the good which is wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, who is the Son of God. But he is not the supreme and highest ground-cause (*ἀρχή*), but this last is the Father; thus we ascend from the Son to the Father.

from the Son in the way of dependence, but is related after the like independent manner to the Father, as the common *ground*; that as the Son is begotten of the Father, so the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father."

As it concerns, on the other hand, the exposition of this doctrine in the Western church, it was believed, especially ever since the time of the more precise logical carrying out of the conception of the unity of essence in the Triad by Augustin, that, in order to hold fast the doctrine in a consistent manner, the inference must necessarily be drawn, that as the Son of God was in all respects identical in essence with the Father, and as the Father had communicated all to the Son, so too the Holy Spirit proceeds as well from the Son as from the Father. There are not two different Spirits, one belonging to the Father, the other to the Son; but there is one spirit of both;—as he is called in the holy scriptures sometimes the Spirit of the Father, sometimes the Spirit of the Son. How, then, could it be otherwise than that he, the Spirit of both, proceeds from both? * As the Homoeousion was made prominent in opposition to Arianism, so it was believed necessary also in the same opposition to express this definition, viz., that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and from the Father, and the contrary appeared as being a remnant of the Arian system of subordination. † Added to this was Augustin's speculative theory concerning the doctrine of the Trinity, by which this definition was favoured; where we must confess that his confusion of metaphysics with religion led him astray. Although a profound experience of the Christian life ever lay at bottom, yet, notwithstanding this, he transported the doctrine of the Trinity very much away from its proper historico-practical ground to a speculative one; and

* See e. g. Augustin. Tract. 100, in evangel. Joh. s. A quo autem habet Filius, ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus), ab illo habet utique, ut etiam de illo procedat Spiritus Sanctus, ac per hoc Spiritus Sanctus, ut etiam de Filio procedat, sicut procedit de Patre ab ipso habet Patre.

† Keeping at a distance all notions of time, and everything that bordered on *subordinationism*, Augustin was unwilling to let even the representation pass, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father to the Son, and then first proceeds from the Son to sanctify the creature. Spiritus Sanctus non de Patre procedit in Filium, et de Filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit, quamvis hoc Filio Pater dederit, ut quemadmodum de se, ita de illo quoque procedit. L. c.

the confusion of two heterogeneous provinces met its appropriate punishment in leading him to mistake a play of analogies for a demonstration. God the Father is the divine Being; the Son is knowledge, as a self-manifestation of this being—hence the Son is begotten of the Father; will, love, as that wherein being and knowing embrace each other, is the fellowship of both, the exhibition of the divine unity; hence the Holy Spirit, as the fellowship, is the love in which both embrace each other, and which proceeds from both. And since the Holy Spirit denotes the fellowship of both, he is also that whereby we may be made partakers of the fellowship with the Father and Son. In all nature too, as a manifestation of God, Augustin believed that he saw a symbol of this Trinity, there being everywhere to be observed a universal being, the particular being, and the unity and harmony of the whole.*

Moreover, the opposition between the two theories came even already to be publicly expressed; although, on the part of the Western church, it was not the Oriental church doctrine, but Arianism; and, although on the part of the Oriental church, it was not the Western church doctrine, but the doctrine of the creation of the Spirit, which constituted the matters of dispute. Nevertheless, the way was thereby prepared for a struggle betwixt the two tendencies. Thus the great Syrian church-teacher, Theodore of Mopsuestia, in his confession of faith, contended against the representation that the Holy Spirit did not derive his essence immediately from God the Father, but had received his existence through the Son.† Cyrill of Alexandria having, in the ninth of his anathemas, pronounced sentence of condemnation on those who denied that the Holy Spirit is a property of Christ,‡ Theodoret remarks upon this, in his refutation of these anathemas: “If it is meant to be said here that the Holy

* Sermo 71, s. 18. In Spiritu Sancto insinuatur Patris Filique communitas. Quod ergo commune est Patri et Filio, per hoc nos habere communionem et inter nos et secum. Serm. 212. Spiritus Sanctus unitas amborum. De Trinitat. l. XV. s. 27. Per Spiritum Sanctum insinuatur caritas, qua invicem se diligunt Pater et Filius.—Esse, species rei et ordo. Confessio, l. XIII. c. 11. de vera religione, s. 13.

† Διὰ υἱοῦ τὴν ὑπαρξίν εἰληφές.

‡ Ἴδιον εἶναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. These words, according to their proper connection, do not belong here, but are taken simply in the connection which Theodoret gave to them, for the purpose of attacking them.

Spirit is of like essence with the Son of God, and proceeds from the Father, let this be conceded; but if it is meant to be said that he has his existence from the Son, or through the Son, let it be rejected as blasphemous;† and he refers for proof to John xv. 26; 1 Corinth. ii. 12. Theodore and Theodoret both evidently intended here to combat but one and the same doctrine—that which favoured the notion of the creation of the Spirit. The same was the case, on the other hand, in the Western church. When the West-Gothic church of Spain, in the time of king Reccared, went over from the Arian doctrine to the Nicene, that Western theory was first adopted as an addition to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed.* At the third ecclesiastical assembly of Toledo, A.D. 589, the creed was presented with this addition, and sentence of condemnation pronounced on those who did not believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, where evidently those were intended who still remained attached to the Arian doctrine which hitherto prevailed there.†

As we observed, the Oriental church was the proper theatre for the controversies on the doctrine of the Trinity, with regard to which the Western church, in the main, kept itself more tranquil. The Anti-Nicene doctrine had found here but few advocates. The most considerable man among these latter was Auxentius, bishop of Milan, who was rather inclined to Semi-Arianism, and who defended the symbol of faith drawn up at Rimini. The major part of his church being satisfied with him, he was protected by the emperor Valentinian, conformably with that prince's maxim of toleration. After the death of Auxentius, in 374, a violent schism arose at the choice of a new bishop. Ambrose, who, as *consular* over the provinces of Liguria and Æmilia, had his headquarters at Milan, deemed it necessary to go himself into the church, and exhort the people from the chancel to be quiet. A child—perhaps so instructed—shouted the name of

* *Spiritus Sanctus, qui procedit a Patre Filioque.*

† A conciliatory mean betwixt the two theories was offered by Augustin's explanation, that inasmuch as the Son has everything from the Father, but everything as shared with the Father, so it might be said, *Spiritus Sanctum principaliter procedere a Patre.* Augustin de Trinitate, l. XV. c. 17, de civitate Dei, l. XI. c. 24; and with this intermediate view the theories of an Athanasius and a Basil might also agree. See above.

Ambrose, and this was considered to be a voice from God in favour of Ambrose, who already, in his civil offices, had acquired universal esteem and love. The fact that he was but a catechumen was not allowed to be any impediment. He was first baptized, and somewhat later ordained as bishop. The church of Milan afterwards came into critical situations, in which she was protected by the energy and firmness which Ambrose had acquired and preserved in other offices and in other relations. The empress Justina, the mother of the young emperor Valentinian II., took advantage of his minority to contrive some method of introducing Arianism, which had zealous friends among the leaders of the allied troops of the Goths. Had Ambrose yielded in a single point, had he given up to them a single church, they would probably have continually gone on increasing their demands. It was said the emperor had power to determine all matters within his government, that the churches belonged to him; Ambrose, on the other hand, affirmed that they were entrusted to him by God. The plans of Justina were met and defeated by his energy, firmness, and superior influence.

Semi-Arianism and Arianism continued to predominate for some time among the rude populations, especially of German origin, which were during this period converted to Christianity; because they had been first instructed by teachers who were attached to those principles; because they held fast to the form in which they had once received Christianity, and this very form may have constituted a convenient point of transition for these rude nations. This mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Trinity may have been better suited to them than the more completely developed Nicene view. It seems to have been a peculiarity of the Semi-Arian theologians, whereby perhaps they were better adapted to be teachers of the rude tribes of people, that, being less practised logicians, they adhered more tenaciously to the simple Bible doctrine, and were not for teaching anything which they could not prove with the exactness of verbal testimony from the Bible. Hence they frequently offered it as an objection to the defenders of the Nicene council, that they were obliged to have recourse to speculative reasoning, instead of the Bible, to prove the Homousion.*

* The Arian Maximinus says to Augustin: Si affirmaveris de divinis

To the rude populations, among whom Arianism found admission, belonged the Vandals. When, in 430, this tribe took possession of North Africa, there arose, under their kings, Genserich and Hunnerich, several violent persecutions against the adherents of the Nicene doctrine. In part, the Vandal princes wished to retaliate the oppressions which their companions in the faith had to suffer in the Roman empire; in part, those of their subjects who agreed in faith with the Roman Christians were objects of suspicion to them; and in part they were led on by the rude, fanatical Arian clergy. Victor, bishop of Vita, in Numidia, near the close of the fifth century, wrote a history of this persecution.

But the new Nicene form of the doctrine of the Trinity, which at length obtained the victory over the older system of subordination, had an important influence also on the whole system of Christian theology. The emanation-doctrine in the Triad left still remaining a point of attachment, a foothold, for the emanation-theory; and accordingly speculative questions of cosmogony might here find scope and encouragement, as in the case of Origen. But then, inasmuch as, by the consistent Athanasian system, the strong line of demarcation was drawn between that which is grounded in the essence of God, derived from that essence, and one and the same with it, and that which had been produced by a divine act of the will out of nothing*—that is, all which must be comprehended under the notion of a creature—so the Christian idea of creation was thus preserved against all confusion with the emanation-theory.

B. *Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ.*

Closely connected with the history of the doctrine of Christ's divine nature, is the history of the doctrine of his human nature, and of the relation of the human element to the divine in his person; for the opposite tendencies in the mode of apprehending the former doctrine would extend their influence also to the different modes of conceiving this latter. They who apprehended the notion of Christ's divinity with

scripturis, si alicubi scriptam lectionem protuleris,—nos divinarum scripturarum optamus inveniri discipuli. Augustin^{us} c. Maximin. Arian. l. i. s. 26.

* Concerning the meaning of this expression, see vol. III

greater exactness, would thereby be led to apprehend with more distinctness and precision the notion of his human nature, and to draw a clearer line of separation between the predicates of the divine and the human nature, in order that they might secure themselves against the transfer of human finitude to the divine essence of Christ. On the other hand, those who represented to themselves the Logos as being the most perfect among all created beings, but still as not being God in the proper sense[†] had therefore no occasion for making precise and accurate distinctions between the divine and human nature of Christ, since their conception of Christ's divine nature did not exclude the supposition of a certain finitude; and the not distinguishing here might in truth be advantageous to their system, and supply many proofs for their subordination-system, which would have been taken away from them by the distinction of two complete natures. And on this point Arius did actually adopt into his system the older, still undefined and undeveloped doctrine, in the form which it had previous to the new stage of development to which it was carried by Tertullian, and more especially by Origen. Arius and Eunomius* made the incarnation of the Logos to consist simply in his becoming united with a human body. Thus they could now avail themselves of all those passages of the New Testament in which they found anything expressed denoting a finite nature, hinting at a subordinate relation of Christ, as evidence against the doctrine of consubstantiality. But if in such passages the defenders of the Homousion met them with the distinction of the two natures by which this was to be explained, then they charged these defenders with denying the true personal unity of the God-man, with making the one Son of God and the one Christ two Sons of God and two Christs †—the same objection which was made to Origen, in the preceding period, when he first gave systematic form to the doctrine of Christ's complete human nature.

Whilst, by Arius and Eunomius, the older church doctrine of Christ's humanity was brought up anew, the older Sabel-

* From Gregor. Nyss. orat. f. 482, it is plain that the words in the confession of faith of Eunomius must read as follows: *Ὁὐκ ἀναλαβὼντα ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἀνθρώπου.*

† See Eunomius against Basil. Gregor. Nyssen. c. Eunom. orat. IV. f. 578.

lianism and the older Samosatēnianism was repeated over again in the doctrines of Marcellus of Ancyra, and of Photinus. As we have already remarked, Marcellus referred everything which seemed to denote a species of dependence, subordination, or limitation, not to the Logos by himself considered, but to his particular active efficiency,* by virtue of which he had taken into union with himself also the human nature of Christ. To this particular efficiency, whereby the divine Logos had, as it were, come forth from the hidden essence of God, he referred the entire human appearance of Christ, which had for its object to manifest God in the sensible nature of man, to elevate man to God and to a participation in the divine life, and to procure for him the victory over sin. Until this object should be attained, the separate kingdom of Christ, growing out of this particular activity of the Logos, was to endure; but as soon as the object was attained, God would withdraw back into himself this efficiency of the Logos which had emanated from him, and the separate kingdom of Christ, therewith connected, would again resolve itself into the one, universal, eternal kingdom of God the Father—all which, as he supposed, could be shown from 1 Cor. xv. 28. This active energy (ἐνεργεία δραστηκή) of the Logos he made to consist, however, in nothing else than the inspiring with a soul the human body, which the Logos, by so doing, appropriated to himself. In his opinion, which agrees in this respect with that of Beryll of Bostra, and of Sabellius, the entire personal existence and consciousness of Christ was a result of this ἐνεργεία δραστηκή. But here, according to his own theory, he must have been surprised by the question and the difficulty, "What, then, was to become of the body of Christ, which had thus been animated with a soul and transfigured to an imperishable existence, when God should once more withdraw into himself the energy of the Logos, that had emanated from him and had effected all this?" Marcellus, who was not a logical systematizer, who was actuated by only one single interest—that of holding fast the unity of the Christian consciousness of God, who ever took the stand of opposition to speculative caprice, and to the dogmatism which was for determining too many things, and would hold fast on nothing but what he believed he found expressly determined in scripture—left the difficulty unsolved; at the

* The ἐνεργεία δραστηκή τοῦ λόγου.

same time affirming that it was not safe to determine anything on this point, since holy writ had given no definite solution of the question.* But the more logical Photinus, to whom the doctrine of the existence of God in Christ seemed less important, was not to be satisfied with thus admitting the difficulty without resolving it; and as he clearly understood and expressed with precision the Samosatenean theory, to which Marcellus unconsciously inclined in his doctrine of the Logos, so he adopted also its peculiar representation of the human nature of Christ. He made the *ἐνεργεία δραστηκή* of the Logos here to consist, not in the animating of the body of Christ with a soul, but in the enlightening influence of the Logos on the man Jesus, consisting of body and soul, whereby he stood pre-eminent over all other prophets and divine messengers, and became the Son of God.†

In opposition to these two tendencies in the mode of conceiving this doctrine, the Arian and the Photinian, the two others now proceeded to form themselves in the dogmatico-polemical interest, maintaining, on the one hand, the completeness of the human nature of Christ, and, on the other, the true personal union of the two natures. According as the one or the other of these predominated, differences would now arise in the mode of apprehending this doctrine. Yet it was sought

* Euseb. c. Marcell. l. II. c. 2, 4.

† This representation of the doctrine of Photinus seems certainly to be in accordance with the majority of the reports of ancient writers: and it was *this* false doctrine which men designated with the name Photinism, while at the same time they were accustomed to compare his theory with that of Paul of Samosata. But still the question arises whether these accounts are perfectly correct. The council of Sirmium in 351, directs against Photinus, among others also, the following anathema: *Εἰ τις τὸ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο ἀκούων, τὸν λόγον εἰς σάρκα μετὰ βιβλῆσθαι νομίζει, ἢ προσην ὑπομνηκότα ἀνελιφεῖναι εἶναι σάρκα.* It cannot be conceived how this could be said in opposition to any Samosatenean tenet; but it is altogether apropos, if Photinus, like his teacher Marcellus, and like Sabellius, derived the entire human existence of Christ from a certain irradiation of the Logos into the *σὰρξ*. Perhaps, however, he differed from Marcellus precisely in this, that he explained the so-constituted personality of Christ as destined indeed to *endure for ever*, but held that his kingdom was to last only for a certain definite period. The ancients do, indeed, sometimes compare Photinus with Sabellius; but it must be owned, their views of the difference between the doctrine of Paul and that of Sabellius were not clear, and this very circumstance may also have led them to a false representation of Photin's doctrine.

at first to hold fast the theory of personal unity along with the completeness of the human nature taken up into union with the Logos, as the essential thing; in doing which many differences in particular modes of conception might have existed, without encroaching on the unity of faith.* The most eminent church-teachers, such as Athanasius, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, laboured to preserve the unity of faith on this side, and to suppress those schisms which were now existing in the bud; but the germ of antagonisms was already formed, which could no longer be suppressed, but must go on to develope themselves without stop or hindrance.

Especially important was the influence of the two great church-teachers of Cappadocia, Gregory of Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, on the development of this doctrine. We find in them the further prosecution of the tendency which commenced with Origen. They adopted from Origen the doctrine, that the Logos united himself, by the mediation of a rational human soul (of a $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\ \nu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$), with the sensuous nature. The essential point of this union, the characteristic mark of the personal unity, they placed in this, namely, that the divine Logos took all the parts of human nature into fellowship with himself, and pervaded them. They affirmed, it is true, that this permeation took place potentially from the first moment of the human existence; but, with Origen, they

* As, for example, Hilary of Poitiers expressed in his own peculiar mode of apprehending the doctrine as follows: Christum sibi animam assummissee ex se et corpus per se, i. e., a soul derived in some way from his divine essence, to which it was especially related; and a body miraculously so wrought by the divine informing power, that although in shape it resembled other human bodies, it was yet of a more exalted nature, so that to all sensuous affections which he was not liable to by any necessity of nature, he voluntarily subjected himself to secure a particular object in view, viz., the salvation of man, κατ' οἰκονομίαν. See Hilar. de Trinitate, l. IX. et X. A doctrine similar to that set forth in the preceding period by Clement of Alexandria, according to which, it must be admitted, especially so far as it concerns the view of Hilary, that the ideal of purely human virtue, which Christ must present, in order to be the Redeemer of mankind and the author of a new moral creation in humanity, could not be rightly understood. To this theory of the body, Hilary suffered himself to be misled by the false ascetic theory which derived sin particularly from the sensuous nature. As it respects the other position, however, the correct notion hovered before his mind, that the human nature of Christ cannot be regarded as one that came in the natural course of the development of sinful humanity.

taught at the same time that its consequences, in respect to all the parts of human nature, did not unfold themselves until after Christ's resurrection; that, after his ascension to glory, his body also became transfigured to a form analogous with the divine essence. See vol. I.

In refutation of the charge brought by Eutomius, that, by the supposition of a complete human nature in Christ, along with the divine nature, a duality was ascribed to him, Gregory of Nyssa says: "Beyond question, such a duality would find place, if, along with the divine nature, there existed in Christ another alien one in its own peculiar characteristic marks and properties. But as everything had been transformed after the analogy of the divine nature, into which the human has arisen, as wood into the fire, such a distinction no longer holds good."* From this theory was derived the argument for a transfer of the divine predicates to the human nature, and vice versa; for a reciprocal interchange of attributes.† As, in the case of Gregory of Nyssa, the principles of the Origenistic system of faith appear everywhere more sharply defined than they do in the case of Gregory of Nazianzen; so he maintained that the glorified body of Christ, by that sublimation (*ἀνάκρασις*) into the essence of the divine nature, laid aside gravity, shape, colour, limitation, all the properties of the sensuous nature; a proper human nature was to be ascribed to it only during the period of its earthly appearance. Hence also he taught the doctrine of the omnipresence of the glorified body of Christ: "After the same manner as Christ exists in the super-terrestrial regions, so also he exists with us in all parts of the world."‡

In opposition to this theory, derived from the Origenistic theology, came forth another system, which once more exerted

* We see here much that is analogous to the later Monophysitism. See Gregor. Nyss. orat. 4, f. 589, T. III. 265. His ep. ad Theophilum.

† The *ἀντιμεθέστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων*, which afterwards became the occasion of so much controversy.

‡ Gregory of Nazianzen expresses himself more temperately. He says we should not attribute to the glorified body of Christ any properly sensuous qualities, but neither again a spiritual essence (*φύσις ἀσώματος*); that it is impossible to determine any thing more than this respecting the nature of his glorified body (*ἁποκρίσις τοῦ σώματος*). Gregor. Naz. orat. 40, f. 641.

a special influence on the course of development of the doctrine we are considering: namely, that of the younger Apollinaris, a man thoroughly trained in the study of the ancient Greek literature, and a native of Laodicea in Syria, of which city he finally became bishop. The great effort of this teacher was again to suppress the doctrine of a perfect human nature taken up into indissoluble union with the divine Logos, which had been first brought into systematic form and obtained authority by means of Origen; and, instead of it, to establish on a firm footing, by new logical grounds and trains of argument, the original doctrine of the union of the Logos solely with the human body. In the case of Apollinaris, the interest of Christian faith was combined with the interest of scientific speculation. He was especially intent, like the older Patripassianists, to preserve this point inviolate, and without any curtailment to the faith—that God revealed himself to him immediately in the appearance of Christ, that nothing intervened to shut him out from the immediate relation to God. This, however, as it seemed to him, was not the case with the theory introduced by Origen and adopted by the church; for in this it seemed to him that the immediate manifestation of God in Christ was not recognized, but only a human spirit was represented as the organ of the divine manifestation. In the next place, it was his opinion, that it belonged to the scientific exposition to bring out into clear consciousness what was contained in the church faith, and to examine, moreover, whether it corresponded to the essence of pure Christianity; whether some Jewish or pagan element had not mixed in with the faith of Christians, as might easily happen, when the faith was proceeding onward in its unconscious development. It was by a credulity which did not stop to examine, that Eve suffered herself to be betrayed.* At the

* The words of Apollinaris are: *Μόναν τὴν εὐσεβῆ πίστιν ἄγαλιν ἢ νομιζέσθαι* (against those who were constantly appealing only to faith, and repelling all new dogmatic investigations as hostile to faith. Against such he would say, that faith, considered by itself alone, mere believing, was of no value; but everything depended on the examination whether that which was the object of faith, really answered to the essence of Christian piety). *Μηδὲ γὰρ τῇ εὐὰ συνείγκειν τὴν ἀνιξιάστον πίστιν, ὥστε προσήκειν καὶ τὴν τῶν χριστιανῶν ἑξιστάμεν εἶναι, μὴ περὶ λάθῃ, τοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἢ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συνειπεσούσα δόξαις.* Gregor. Nyss. Antirrhetic. adv. Apollinar. sec. iv. p. 130.

basis, then, of this exposition by Apollinaris, lay the principle, that the end to be sought in a scientific examination of the church system of faith was to preserve the purely Christian elements of that faith from the intermixture of foreign Jewish and pagan elements; and, where such an intermixture had already taken place, to purge away the dross. • How salutary would have been the effect on the Christian life, how many errors adulterating pure Christianity would have been prevented from being propagated by church tradition to the following centuries, if this principle of Apollinaris had been received appropriated, and consistently applied!

Apollinaris supposed he was able to demonstrate with mathematical certainty* how it was necessary for any one to regard the person of Christ if he would consistently recognize him as the God-man. "Either," said he, speaking against the doctrine of the union of the deity and humanity in Christ conceived after the manner above described, "either the man who was taken into union with the divine Logos retained his own self-determining free-will; and in this case it was impossible that any true personal union could take place. The man endowed with a free-will is but an organ, through which the Logos acts, in like manner as he made prophets and holy men serve as organs of his activity.† Christ differs only in degree from other divinely enlightened messengers of God. He is not the God-man, but only a divine man, just as believers come to be:—only a man serving as an organ of the divine will.‡ Or we must suppose, that the human nature suffered the loss of its free-will in this union with the divine Logos. But, as this belongs to the essence of human nature, the latter, in losing the free-will, ceases to be any longer a human nature, and consequently nothing more is now to be said of a union of divinity and humanity. At the same time it is not to be conceived that God, the creator of human nature, would so deprive it of that which constitutes its essence, and consequently annihilate it."§

* Γνωματερίκαις ἀποδιύξεισι καὶ ἀνάγκαις.

† Σοφία φωσιζούσα νοῦν ἀνθρώπου, αὕτη δὲ καὶ ἐν πάσιν ἀνθρώποις. L. c. 215.

‡ Οὐχ ὁ ἱππουρανίος ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἱππουρανίου Θεοῦ δοχσίον. L. c. 255.
"Ἀνθρώπος ἑνός."

§ Φθόρα τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου ζώου τὸ μὴ εἶναι αὐτεξουσίον· οὐ φθίρεται δὲ ἡ φύσις ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιησάντος αὐτήν. L. c. 245.

Apollinaris, therefore, who took the same liberty of drawing his own conclusions from the positions of his opponents, and arguing against them, as his opponents took with regard to his, and so of charging them with all the consequences which seemed necessarily to flow from their principles judged from his own point of view, laid it as a charge against his antagonists that, like Paul of Samosata and Photinus, they recognized in Christ not the God-man, but only the divine man;* that they made of Christ two persons, two Sons of God, a Son of God in the proper sense, and a Son of God in the improper sense.†

The doctrine concerning Christ, as the God-man, Apollinaris held to be the properly characteristic and fundamental doctrine of Christianity. That Christ was a man united with God, and performed miracles in the exercise of a divine power, he supposed, even Jews and Pagans might concede, as the Jews said the same thing in fact of Elijah; but faith in the God-man was that which constituted the Christian.‡

But how then did Apollinaris realize to himself, from his own point of view, the idea of the God-man, which seemed to him so important? Two beings persisting in their completeness, he conceived, could not be united into one whole. Out of the union of the *perfect* human nature with the Deity one person never could proceed,§ and more particularly the rational soul of the man could not be assumed into union with the divine Logos so as to form *one* person. This was the negative side of the doctrine of Apollinaris: but, as to its positive side, this was closely connected with his peculiar views of human nature. He supposed, with many others of his time, that human nature

* Τὸ ἀνθρώπον ἔνθεν τὸν Χριστὸν ὀνομάζειν, ἵναντίον εἶναι ταῖς ἀποστολικαῖς διδασκαλίαις, ἀλλότριον δὲ τῶν συνόδων, Παύλον δὲ καὶ Φωτίνον καὶ Μαρκελλὸν τῆς τοιαυτῆς διαστρέφης κατὰρξαι. 135, l. c. On his own principles he understood the words ἀνθρώπος ἔνθεος καὶ θεῖος as synonymous; since, according to his theory, a man composed of spirit and body, in whom God dwelt, could be none else than a divine man specially actuated by the Divine Spirit. It is deserving of notice, also, how wrongly he conceived of the doctrine of his contemporary, Marcellus of Ancyra. See above.

† A son φύσει, and a son barely θείσει. See l. c. p. 209, p. 185, 232.

‡ L. c. p. 184.

§ A maxim of Apollinaris: Εἰ ἀνθρώπου τελείῳ συνήθηθαι θεὸς τελείως δύο ἂν ἦσαν υἱοί. L. c. 223.

consisted of three parts—the rational soul, which constitutes the essence of man's nature;* the animal soul, which is the principle of animal life;† and the body, between which and the spirit that soul is the intermediate principle. The body, by itself considered, has no faculty of desire; but this soul, which is united with it, is the source and fountain of the desires that struggle against reason. This soul Apollinaris believed he found described also by the apostle Paul in the passage where he speaks of the flesh striving against the spirit.‡ The human, mutable spirit was too weak to subject to itself this resisting soul; hence the domination of the sinful desires. In order, therefore, to the redemption of mankind from the dominion of sin, it was necessary that an immutable divine spirit, the Logos himself, should enter into union with these two parts of human nature. It does not pertain to the essence of that lower soul, as it does to the essence of the higher soul, that it should determine itself; but, on the contrary, that it should be determined and ruled by a higher principle. But the human spirit was too weak for this; the end and destination of human nature, therefore, is realised when the Logos, as an immutable divine spirit, rules over this lower soul, and thus restores the harmony between the lower and the higher principles in man's nature.§

In this way Apollinaris supposed that he avoided all the difficulties which attended the other theory, and that he had demonstrated how the divine and human natures in Christ must be conceived to be united into personal unity. Christ, like every other man, consisted of three parts, of spirit, soul, and body; but with this difference, that in his case the place of the weak and mutable human spirit was filled by an immutable divine spirit: for this reason, therefore, is Christ also the God-man, a name which could not otherwise be ascribed to him. This difference between Christ and other men Apollinaris believed might also be clearly pointed out in his life. All human development is progressive; it proceeds from conflict

* Ψυχὴ λογικὴ, πνεῦμα, νοῦς.

† The ψυχὴ ἄλογος.

‡ L. c. p. 138.

§ The νοῦς is, by nature, the αὐτοκίνητος, the ψυχὴ ἄλογος, the ἐπιτεκνίητος. Οὐκ ἄρα σώζεται τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος δι' ἀναλήψεως νοῦ καὶ ὄλου ἀνθρώπου ἀλλὰ διὰ προσλήψεως σαρκὸς, ἥ φυσικὸν μὲν τὸ ἡγεμονεύεσθαι, ἰδίῳ δὲ ἀπείπτου νοῦ, μὴ ὑποκείμεντος αὐτῇ διὰ ἐπιστημοσύνης ἀσθενίαν, ἀλλὰ συναρμολογῶντος αὐτὴν ὀβιαστῶς ἑαυτῇ.

and effort, for the very reason that the human spirit is a mutable one, which can only seek to subject the inferior soul to itself by degrees. But we find nothing of this kind in the case of Christ, who from the first ruled the inferior soul by his transcendent, divine Spirit.* The union of the divine Logos with a *perfect human nature* takes place only in the case of individual believers, who, by their fellowship with the God-man, are made to partake of his victory over sin and his dominion over the inferior soul.† With this theory Apollinaris believed he possessed the advantage of being able, without harm to the unaltered properties of all parts of the human nature which the divine Logos assumed into union with himself, to affirm the unity of person, and, as evidence of this, the interchange of attributes.‡ He was fond of certain expressions entirely at variance with the scripture phraseology, and which began now for the first time to become current, “God died, God was born.”§ He maintained that worship was due to the sensuous nature united with the Logos in one person;|| a thing which, on the other hand, they who attributed to Christ a perfect human nature could not maintain, without adding a fourth essence to the Trinity. He now brought it as a charge against his opponents that they were obliged to suppose a change in Christ’s body, a deification of it contradictory to its own nature, and to represent the true union of the divinity and the humanity as being the result of Christ’s resurrection;¶ of which charge the above described theory of Gregory of Nyssa, and other theologians trained in the school of Origen, especially furnished the occasion. He controverted the theory of the human omnipresence of Christ, teaching that Christ, although in respect to his body he was in heaven, yet in respect to his divine essence united with the body, is everywhere with believers.**

* The inference of Apollinaris: Οὐδεμία ἀσκήσις ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐκ ἀεὶ νῦν ἰστὶν ἀνθρώπινος. L. c. 221.

† Ἐν τῇ ἱεροκινήτῃ καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ νῦν ἐνεργουμένη σάρκι τιλείται τὸ ἔργον, ὃ ἔστι λύσις ἀμαρτίας, μεταλαμβάνει δὲ τῆς λύσεως ὁ ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοκίνητος νῦς, καθ’ ὅσον οἰκεῖοι ἑαυτὸν Χριστῷ. P. 220. In the case of Christ, there was only a πρόσληψις σάρκος—in that of individual believers, an ἀναλήψις ὅλου ἀνθρώπου.

‡ The ἀντιμισθίασις τῶν ὁνομάτων.

§ See l. c. 264.

|| L. c. 241.

¶ See l. c. p. 277, 284.

** Ὅτι καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ ὄντος τοῦ σώματος, μὴ ἡμῶν ἔστι μίχρι τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος. C. 59. p. 286.

According to this connection of ideas, it would seem that in the same manner as the older Patripassianists conceived of the whole being of God as constituting the animating soul of the human body in which it dwelt, so also Apollinaris would conceive of the whole being of the divine Logos as constituting the animating soul in the human nature of Jesus. In this case, however, it is difficult to explain how a man of his sagacity could fail to be struck with the great difficulties attending such a supposition. Yet, to judge from a single remark of Apollinaris, it would seem that, in endeavouring to avoid these difficulties, and to make the matter clearly conceivable, he touched, without intending it, upon the ideas of Beryll of Bostra and of Sabellius, and fell into that view of the personality of Christ according to which it was not one commensurate with the whole being of the Logos, but formed from a certain influx or irradiation of the Logos into the human body.*

U

* It is a remark of Apollinaris, which is to be found in Gregory of Nyssa, c. 29, and which appeared to that father himself somewhat obscure. On the language of Christ, in the gospel of John, "My Father works hitherto, and I work," he observes that Christ here places his own action on an equality with that of the Father, according to the spirit; but that, according to the flesh, he makes a distinction (*διαίρων μὲν τὴν ἐνεργίαν κατὰ σάρκα, ἐξίσων δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα*). Next he goes on to say, that this expression denotes, on the one hand, the equality in respect of power; on the other, the distinction as to the mode of action, in respect of the flesh; by virtue of which, John v. 21, he did not quicken all, but those whom he willed. (*"Ὅστις ἔχει τὴν ἐν δυνάμει πάλιν ἰσοσθέντα καὶ τὴν κατὰ σάρκα τῆς ἐνεργείας διαίρεισιν, καθ' ἣν οὐ πάντας ἐξωοποιήσε, ἀλλὰ τινὰς, οὓς ἐθέλουσιν.*) Yet here Apollinaris plainly fixes a distinction between the unlimited, infinite activity of the Logos, considered by himself, and his limited activity, affected by the existence in the flesh. So far as Christ is conscious of his being one with God, he ascribes to himself the power, like the Father, to impart life to all; so far as his being is conditioned by the *σάρξ*, he is conscious of being able to awaken to life (which Apollinaris understood without doubt as referring to the resurrection of the body) only in a limited degree. Thus the Logos does not reveal himself here in a way that corresponds to his divine essence, considered by itself, but in one that corresponds to his form of manifestation conditioned and determined by the *σάρξ*, animated by him with a rational soul. But this point in his system he probably did not make any clearer to himself. Had he made clear to his own consciousness what lay at the bottom of this, his theory, he would have been forced to give up a great deal which he felt it to be extremely important to hold fast. The conflicting elements in his system here come into collision

Apollinaris had no intention to separate himself from the Catholic church, to set up a particular theory at variance with the old church doctrine, and found a distinct sect; for he was convinced that the essence of the church doctrine was expressed in a consistent manner only in his own theory, and that the scheme which had proceeded from the Origenistic school was self-contradictory. Accordingly, he could with honesty subscribe, through his delegates, the articles which were established by the aforesaid synod held at Alexandria, A.D. 362, in opposition to the above-described Arian doctrine concerning Christ's human nature. He directed his name to be subscribed to the articles, by which the hypothesis of a body without soul or spirit (*σῶμα ἄψυχον καὶ ἀνόητον*) in Christ was condemned; for he also did, in fact, suppose a soul which belonged in connection with the body, and also a spirit which directed the soul in Christ. He believed that all this was first presented and established by his own theory in a tenable form, and in a way which corresponded to the idea of the God-man.* But when Apollinaris came out more openly with his doctrine, and supposed that he had demonstrated in an irrefragable manner what belonged to the completeness of the conception of the God-man, Athanasius affirmed, in opposition to him, that the true Christ was incapable of being construed by human reason.†

The controversy which was carried on against the doctrines of Apollinaris led men to think of the necessary connection between the recognition of a perfect, spiritual, and sensuous human nature, and the doctrine concerning that which constituted a Redeemer and the redemption, in its more exact relations to a systematic body of divinity.

Athanasius, for example, in his work against Apollinaris, alleges, in opposition to his doctrines, substantially the following reasons: "How could Christ represent for us the pattern of the holy life after which we ought to strive, if his nature was not entirely homogeneous with ours? He could not redeem human nature in its completeness, unless he had himself assumed all the parts of which it consists." He points to

* See the explanation of Apollinaris himself, in his letter to the synod at Diocæsarea. Leontius Byzantin. c. fraudes Apollinaristarum, in Canisii lectiones antiquæ. T. f. 608, ed. Basnage.

† 'Ο ἀληθινὸς Χριστὸς οὐχ' ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπινου λογίσμου διαγραφῆσται. Adv. Apollinaristas, l. i. sec. 13

those affections and actions of Christ which could be conceived only as belonging to a human soul ; as, for example, his sorrow and mortal agony, his praying, his descent to Hades for the redemption of the spirits in prison.* If Apollinaris says that Christ could not assume the human soul free from sin, without subjecting it to a violence destructive of its essential nature, such a theory, Athanasius alleged, whereby sin was supposed to be a necessary thing in human nature, led to Manicheism.† According to this, sin would be the nature of man, and freedom from sin stand in contradiction with his nature. But directly the opposite was the case, freedom from sin was man's *original* nature ; it was only by reason of the corruption of that original nature, sin had obtained such dominion over it. Christ elevated it once more to its original freedom. There lay here, at the bottom of the controversy between the two theories, different conceptions with regard to freedom, which somewhat later, amidst the Pelagian disputes, were still more clearly brought out. Apollinaris understood by freedom, the freedom of choice ; Athanasius understood by it, freedom to goodness, to moral development undisturbed by anything of a foreign nature. Gregory of Nazianzen says, in opposition to Apollinaris : " Christ must, in his character of Redeemer, appear in human nature, not barely because he made use of human nature as a sensible veil, and must bring down the divine element to man's apprehension in this sensible veil ; for if so, he might in truth have chosen any other sensible veil as the organ for its manifestation ; but he must assume the *human* nature, in order to make *man* holy ; consequently he must assume the whole man, consisting of soul and body."

* The opinion, however, is assuredly without any foundation, that the opposition to Apollinarianism led to the adoption into the Apostles' Creed of the article respecting the design of Christ's descensus ad inferos ; for this must far rather have been made a prominent point long before this, in opposition to the Gnostics, who wholly denied the descensus Christi ad inferos. Apollinaris did not deny this, although his opponents objected to him, that this, as well as many other doctrines belonging to the essence of orthodoxy, could not be reconciled with his theory. We have his own words, in which he holds forth this doctrine ; if it be true that it is the same Apollinaris who is cited in the Catena Nicephori, Lips. 1772, T. I. 1475. He considered this descensus as constituting a part of the pain and anguish of Christ's death.

† Ep. ad Cledon. and orat. 51

Moreover, through public synodal articles, the opposition to the doctrine of Apollinaris was expressed by Western councils subsequent to the year 376, and by the second general council of Constantinople. Yet no more new articles of doctrine concerning the divine and human nature in Christ were publicly established in this controversy.

REMARK.—The continuation of the history of the development of this doctrine follows in the next section. . .

END OF PART FIFTH OF THE ORIGINAL.

CONTINUATION OF THE FOURTH SECTION.

History of the Doctrine concerning the Person of Christ.

FROM the time of the Apollinarian disputes, the different tendencies already noticed by us as existing at an earlier period, in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ, proceeded to unfold themselves to more decided opposition, according as the doctrine was set forth either in antithesis to the scheme of Apollinaris, or to that of Photinus. This difference of doctrinal tendencies was not grounded merely, however, in a difference of outward and local relations: it had its still deeper ground in an essential difference pervading the whole dogmatic spirit. Those who were predominantly inclined to the side of feeling and religious contemplation, made it their chief concern, in opposition to the Photinian views,—which recognized only a distinction of degree between the Son of God and other enlightened and holy men,—to bring out distinctly the difference of kind between the fact of God's *becoming* man, and a mere influence of God upon a man; and to fix the attention upon the incomprehensible and inexplicable side of the mystery. Those, on the other hand, who were more inclined to seek after clear and well-defined conceptions for the understanding, made it their chief object to distinguish and separate in their conceptions those elements which, in feeling and the mere intuitions of feeling, were apt to be confounded together; and thus, in opposition to Gnostic and Apollinarian modes of apprehension, they were led to insist upon the abiding distinction of the divine and human natures, each retaining its own separate individuality. The first of these tendencies we find more particularly represented in the church and school of Alexandria; the other, in the church and school of Antioch. This

difference may in part be accounted for by what we have already said, in the introduction to this section, concerning the general character of these schools.

The Antiochian school could hardly fail to be led, by its prevailing historico-grammatical tendency, to give more importance than others were wont to do, to the human side in the life of Christ. Where an allegorical or otherwise artificial method of interpretation easily contrived means to obscure the plainly manifested human element in the life of Christ, the principles of interpretation adopted by that church naturally produced the contrary effect. While other schools adjusted and interpreted all the appearances brought to view in the gospel narrative, according to a doctrinal conception of Christ already fixed and established, this school, on the other hand, formed its conception of Christ from the gospel history. On determining the sense of those passages where Christ himself speaks of his knowledge as being, in a certain respect, limited, they could not be so easily satisfied with the forced explanations to which others had recourse. The simple contemplation and exposition of the gospel narrative led men, like Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, to adopt such views of Christ as did not exclude the idea of a process of development in him corresponding to the ordinary course of human nature, and like that, in a certain sense, progressively advancing and making its way through trials and difficulties. This mode of representation, however, either was not, or did not continue to be, in the case of Theodore, a mere isolated notion, taken up for some immediate purpose; but it formed a necessary organic member in the well-concocted whole of his dogmatic system, whose central point was the doctrine concerning Christ. In order to a right understanding of this, it will be necessary here for us to go back and consider certain points pertaining to his doctrine of human nature, which cannot be seen in their proper place and relation without taking into view the latter.

Theodore supposes two portions or states in the entire history of the creation: the rational nature, left, at all stages of its existence, to itself—changeable, and exposed to temptations;—and, on the other hand, the rational nature, raised, by the communication of a divine life pervading and transfiguring it, above the limitation of a finite existence, delivered from all temptations and conflicts, and placed in an unchangeable state

of moral purity. The one portion extends to the general resurrection, the other follows after it.* Man, who is the representation of God's image for the whole creation, is the medium of transition from the first of these states to the second. This transition could be no otherwise brought about than by the elevation of the human nature itself to communion with God, and, by means of this, to a life exalted above change and temptation. This was the end of Christ's appearance, by which God's image first became truly realized in human nature; man first raised to that dominion over all nature, for which he was destined at the creation, and made the object of reverence and worship for all created beings.† Now, in order to accomplish this, God must take upon him human nature in its peculiar condition of mutability, and, by means of the conflicts and temptations which belong to this state, form it for that higher condition which is the end of all development. Human nature must appear therefore, at first, even in Christ, as a nature subjected to temptations and conflicts; and this presupposes a free-will, in which is implied, though without the presence of sinfulness or of any actual sin, yet the possibility of sinning.‡ Without such a free, self-determining will, a

* *Excerpta Marii Mercatoris* ed. Garnier. p. 100. *Placuit Deo in duos status dividere creaturam; unum quidem, qui præsens est, in quo mutabilia omnia fecit; alterum autem qui futurus est, cum renovans omnia ad immutabilitatem transferet.*

† See the fragment of Theodore, in the book written on purpose to refute him, by Johannes Philoponus. It contains his commentary on the history of the creation, in Genesis. l. VI. c. 10. 'Ο Θεὸς τὰ τῆς εἰκόνος ἡμῶν διασῶσαι βουλόμενος, ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἡμῶν ἕνα λάβων, ἀθάνατον τὸ καὶ ἀτρέπτου ποιήσας, εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἑαυτῷ συνάψας, ἵνα μὴ μόνον εἰς ὕψος τυγχάναν, παρὰ πάσης προσκυνῆται τῆς κτίσεως, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ κατὰ πάντα φοβηρὸς τε καὶ ἀνεπιβουλευτὸς ἢ τοῖς ἐναντίοις, ἅτε μηδμίαν παρατροπὴν ἢ ἀλλοίωσιν ὑπομένειν οἴσται ὢν. According to this theory, he could explain the eighth Psalm, it is true, as relating immediately to human nature in general; but yet maintain that, in its highest meaning, and in the whole extent of its contents, it refers to Christ, as the one in whom all that is said in this Psalm of human nature, became first fully realized. See the fragment of his commentary on the eighth Psalm, in Corderii *Catena in Psalmos*, f. 166. *Comp. Concil. œcum. V. Collat. IV. c. 19.*

‡ Hence Theodore supposed in the history of the temptation, which he considered as a transaction of the inner sense through the medium of a visionary appearance and communication of the evil spirit, an inward possibility in Christ of being tempted, so that he victoriously withstood the temptation by the power of his will. See the fragment from Theo-

true human nature cannot exist. Conflict by means of free-will appeared, moreover, to Theodore the necessary condition of all progress in the development of rational creatures. Without this the bestowment of that higher state of immutability, to which Christ was to attain by the resurrection, and to which through him mankind and the whole world of spirits was also destined to attain, could appear no otherwise than as an act of God's arbitrary will; not, as it is represented in sacred scripture, the merited reward of a victorious conflict.* Now in this way Theodore might have been led to the doctrine of a deification of the human nature in Christ, somewhat like the later Socinian view, and consequently excluding the notion of a true being of God in Christ. But he was remote from this, so far at least as he expressed himself with consciousness. He sincerely adopted the doctrine of the church respecting the divine incarnation. He by no means accommodated himself, barely in compliance with prevailing authority, to the expressions of the church, meaning to explain them in a different and alien sense; but he wished to frame to himself, after the analogy of human nature and his contemplation of the life of Christ, a definite conception of that which is to be understood by Christ as God-man in his earthly appearance. The progressive deification of the human nature in Christ up to the time of his ascension to glory, he contemplated as a consequence and effect of the original and hidden union,—the very end for which God had appropriated the human nature even from its birth; but this union, existing from the first and pre-supposed through the whole life of Christ, by virtue of his constantly victorious conflict, revealed itself in a gra-

dore's work against the emperor Julian, published by Münter, *fragmenta patrum Græcorum*, fascic. I. "The end of the temptation, *ἵνα καθαρῶς ἀναμαρτήτος ὄσθῃ, οὐ τῷ μὴ πειρασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ τῷ φυλάσσειν πειράσεως—ὡς ἀνθρώπος ἀληθῶς πειραζόμενος.*"

* L. c. Concil. V. Collat. IV. Ita et animam Christi utpote humanam et sensus participem (partaking of human feelings and affections) prius accipiens et per resurrectionem in immutabilitatem constituens, sic et nobis eorumdem istorum per resurrectionem præbuit communionem. Post resurrectionem e mortuis et in cælos ascensum impassibilis factus et immutabilis. Before his resurrection Christ was mutabilis in cogitationibus suis; it was not till after his resurrection he became immutabilis. In this sense he explains 1 Tim.: *ἰδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι*, referring it to the ἀναμαρτησία first communicated to him in its strict and proper sense by the Divine Spirit after the resurrection.

dually progressive manner in its effects, as the orderly process of the development of human nature required.* By virtue of that union he developed his human faculties, both moral and intellectual, far more rapidly than other men; hence, in his temptations, he was not left to himself, but came off victorious by means of this union, although not without the co-operation of his own free will. In a measure always proportionate to the bent of his own will manifested in the conflict, was revealed through him the divine power of the Logos constantly united with him, thus raising him step by step to continually higher degrees of glory, till he attained to the highest and most perfect degree after his resurrection. Thus Theodore could now apply, even to the humanity of Christ, a principle to which he attached the greatest importance; namely, that there is no such thing as unconditional predestination, that this is uniformly conditioned by the foreknowledge of the bent of the human will.† God ordained the man Jesus to that supreme dignity which he was to receive in part from the time of his birth, and to enjoy in its *whole extent* after the resurrection, because he foreknew that his will would persevere in its fidelity through every temptation.

Let us illustrate these statements by citing some of the explanations of Theodore himself:—"Thus we see him," says he, "before the cross, hungry and athirst; afraid, and of many things ignorant; for out of himself he brought with

* Theodore's fundamental principle. Concil. V. Collat. IV. c. 49. *Gratia data naturam non immutat.*

† Even the ancients justly observed the inner connection between the Christology and the anthropology of the Antiochian school, and the affinity grounded on this circumstance between Pelagianism and Nestorianism. Vid. Phot. cod. 54, which is an extract from an ancient writing against Pelagianism and Nestorianism, belonging to the early times of the sixth century, wherein it is said: Οἱ μὲν (the Pelagians) περὶ τῶν μέλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀποθρασύνονται (they attribute too much to the man, to the free will in believers), οἱ δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ σώματος κεφαλῆς, τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν διανοίαν καὶ τόλμαν ἔχουσι. On the other side, as, for instance, in the case of Augustin, his opposite views of anthropology stood in connection with his opposite Christological notions. Thus he adduced the mode of union between the divinity and humanity in Christ, in proof of the assertion, that the operations of divine grace could not be conditioned on the merit of the human will. Neque enim et ipse ita verbo Dei conjunctus, ut ipsa conjunctione unus Filius Dei et idem ipse unus filius hominis fieret, præcedentibus suæ voluntatis meritis fecit. Augustin. de peccatorum meritis et remissione. L. II. s. 27.

him the purpose of virtue.* Of this Isaiah testifies, when he says, 'Before the child understands and distinguishes good and evil, he resists the evil to choose the good.' Is. vii. 16.† That is, before he came to the age at which other men are usually able to distinguish what ought to be done, he knew how to distinguish good and evil, because he possessed somewhat beyond that which belongs to other men; for if, even among ourselves, we often meet with those who, though children in years, yet discover great wisdom, in so much as to excite the wonder of those that behold them, much more must the man of whom we speak have surpassed all others at the same period of life"‡ He ascribed, therefore, to our Saviour, at every period of his earthly life, a knowledge transcending the limits of ordinary human knowledge, and, in general, a knowledge far exceeding the capabilities of human nature; but still no participation in the divine omniscience. His theory enabled him to take those passages in which Christ declares himself to be ignorant of the time of the last judgment, in their proper and natural sense;—a view afterwards condemned as heretical under the name of *Agnoëtism*.§ The words of Luke, that Jesus "grew, and waxed strong in spirit,

* He means, on this account Christ had to pass through these conflicts.

† Namely, according to the Alexandrian version. Theodore did not hesitate, therefore, to recognize this passage as one that relates to the Messiah.

‡ Out of the seventh book of Theodore on the incarnation, cited in Leontius of Byzantium. *Contra Nestorium et Eutychem*, l. III. f. 701, T. IX. bibl. patr. Lugd.

§ Ante crucem (*i.e.* before he came to share, by his exaltation to glory, in the attribute of the divine omniscience), eum *ignorare* reperimus. Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. IX. f. 701. At the same time, it may seem strange, that, in a fragment of his commentary on the gospel according to John, he should say, speaking of the inquiry which Christ made after the grave of Lazarus:—"Our Saviour did not ask this question because he did not know: for how could it be thus when he had already announced the fact that Lazarus was dead?" Vid. Corderij Catena in Joannem, f. 288. Either this fragment did not come from Theodore (who in the Catena is sometimes confounded with other writers), or else we must presume it to have been his meaning, that in this particular case, there was no sufficient reason for supposing Christ to have been really ignorant of the fact respecting which he inquired, inasmuch as the question might be very well explained, as having been proposed simply with a view of leading to the further development of his intentions with regard to Lazarus.

filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon him," he explained as meaning that with the progress of time Jesus grew in wisdom and in corresponding virtue, while both were increased by the favour which he had with God. "In all this he increased both with God and with men; men saw, indeed, the progress; but God not only saw it; but approved it by his testimony, and co-operated with him in his actions. It is also manifest that he practised every virtue in a more perfect manner and with greater ease than other men; because, from his very conception, God had united him with himself; ever continued to bestow on him that larger measure of co-operating power which was requisite in order to the great work of salvation; guided all his efforts, exciting him to strive continually after higher perfection, and in many cases relieving and lightening his labours, whether of the body or of the mind."*

• Regarding the exaltation of Christ, considered as man, to the divine immutability by means of his resurrection and ascension to glory, as a reward of the holy life which he had maintained through every trial, Theodore inferred that it was not in the power of Christ to send the Holy Spirit until after this change had taken place. Hence he explained the symbolical act of our Saviour, and the accompanying words addressed to the disciples after his resurrection (John xx. 22), as being simply a prophetic allusion to the communication of the Holy Spirit, which was not to be actually realized until afterwards.† He supposed also, that as the divine majesty of Christ was not revealed until after his exaltation to heaven and the transfiguration of his human nature, so it was not known among men until after the effusion of the Holy Spirit. Here was another point in which he did not allow himself to be fettered by the common doctrinal and exegetical tradition.

Neither Nathaniel, Peter, nor the Marthas, did by their confessions of Christ, in which they called him the Son of the living God, intimate that they believed in his divinity; this would indeed have been very remote from that common notion of the Messiah entertained by the Jews, which was their point of departure.‡ It was enough for them, at the outset, to recognize in his appearance something which vastly transcended

* L. c. 701.

† Concil. V. Collat. IV. c. 14.

‡ The testimony of Theodore is important here also, as coming from

what appeared in other men. But, after his resurrection, they were, by the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, guided to a perfect knowledge, so that they recognized what it was that distinguished him above all other men; what belonged to him, not as in the case of others, by dignity conferred from without; but by a peculiar right, and by virtue of his union with the divine Logos, through which union he came to participate, after his ascension to heaven, in all equal honour with the latter.* Accordingly he explained the exclamation of Thomas, "My Lord, and my God!"—as an utterance of surprise; since the resurrection of Christ could be no certain evidence of his divinity.†

The controversies with the Apollinarians, against whom this school in Syria had often to contend, led him to unfold this part of his theory still further. Apollinaris, starting with the position that Christ must be regarded as perfectly holy from the beginning, that it would be presumption to ascribe to him a progressive development by means of conflict and trial, inferred that, instead of the changeable human spirit, we must necessarily suppose him to have been possessed of only an unchangeable divine spirit. On the other hand, Theodore disputed the position itself, from which the conclusion of Apollinaris was drawn. He maintained that it was impossible not to recognize in Christ a progressive development by means of conflict and trial, without pronouncing the evangelical record a fable; and that all this was moreover necessarily required, in order to complete the work of redemption. But all this seemed to him perfectly inconceivable without the supposition of a human soul in Christ. "How could Christ," says he, "have experienced fear in the passion, if Deity took the place in him of the sensitive human soul? What need had he, in the approaching anguish, of that fervent prayer which he ad-

one who was at home in those countries: *Judæi et Samaritæ talia sperantes plurimum, quantum Dei verbi a scientia longe erant.*

* L. c. 25.

† C. 15, and the explanation of Matth. viii., touching the cure of the centurion, which shows his exegetical freedom, where he says of him: *Neque enim tanquam Dei Filium, et ante omnem creaturam subsistentem, et omnium, quæ sunt, opificem, adierat centurio. Hæc enim neque discipulorum erat tunc scire ante crucem; sed tanquam hominem per virtutem adeptum majorem quam est hominis potestatem.* See *Facund. Hermian.* l. III. c. iv.

dressed to God with a loud voice and many tears? How came he to be so overwhelmed with fear, that his sweat was as great drops falling down to the ground?" He referred to the appearance of the angel, whom Christ needed to strengthen and comfort him. The angel, he observes, admonished him to endure with constancy, to overcome the weakness of human nature, and pointed out to him the benefits to be gained by his sufferings, and the glory which was to follow.* He affirmed, in opposition to Apollinaris, that Christ, being free from sensual desires, had to maintain the conflict rather with emotions rising up in his soul, than with the desires and pains of the body†—which, according to Theodore's views, did by no means necessarily imply the existence of a sinful (peccable) nature in Christ, but only the mutability and capability of being tempted inseparable from the essence of the human soul in its present condition. It was indeed particularly the soul which needed to be healed. From the fact that Christ achieved and maintained the victory over avarice and ambition, the body as such (whose desires, according to Apollinaris, needed to be subdued by the power of the Holy Spirit) gained absolutely nothing; since by such desires in fact the body cannot be subdued. But if it were not the soul, but only the Deity, which gained this victory, no advantage could have accrued from all this to us, and the conflict of our Lord would have been a mere empty show.‡ The words of Christ to Peter, Matt. xvi. 23, seemed necessarily to presuppose it as possible, that those words of Peter could have produced some effect on his mind. It is, says he, as if Christ had said to Peter: I shall suffer death with better courage, for the sake of the many benefits to which I and, through me, all shall attain. Pain and disturb not my mind, by exhorting me to shun death as an ignominious thing.§ "What need," says he, "had the divinity of the only-begotten Son, of the anointing by the Holy Ghost, or the power of the Spirit, in order to work miracles? What need had he of the Spirit, in order to learn, in order to appear

* Extracts from his work against the Apollinarists. Concil. V. Col-lat. IV. c. iv.

† Plus inquietabatur dominus et certamen habebat ad animæ passionis, quam corporis. L. c. 27.

‡ L. c. 27. Et videntur domini certamina ostentationis cujusdam gratia fuisse.

§ L. c. v.

without spot or blemish?*" When it is said, that he was led of the Spirit into the wilderness, this surely presupposes in general, that he was guided, ruled, instructed, strengthened in his thoughts by the Spirit; but if, instead of the soul, the *Deity* only dwelt within him, the strength of that was sufficient for everything; and the aid of the Holy Spirit would have been superfluous."†

Apollinaris, again, went on the principle, that it was absolutely inadmissible to compare the essential indwelling of God in Christ with the mode of the relation in which God stood, in other cases, to enlightened and holy men. He called that peculiar mode of the being of God in Christ, a substantial, essential indwelling (*κατ' οὐσίαν, οὐσιῶδες*). Theodore, on the contrary, endeavoured to illustrate the peculiar mode in which Christ was united with God by comparing it with the manner in which God, in general, was nearer to *certain* reasonable beings than to other creatures; and here he adopted the fundamental points of a theory already unfolded by Diodore of Tarsus.‡ In his work on the incarnation of God, which was directed, as it seems, particularly against the Apollinarian doctrines, he inquired as to what formulas were best suited to designate that which was of the like kind in this relation of God to certain rational beings, and at the same time to exclude in the most certain manner all false, anthropopathic notions. "Are we to speak of an indwelling of God in his essential nature? But, in his essential nature, God can nowhere be either included or excluded: as the omnipresent Being, he stands in the like relation to all. Or shall we suppose the indwelling presence of God to be a presence, not in his essence, but in his energy (not *κατ' οὐσίαν*, but *κατ' ἐνεργίαν*)? But in case we maintained that God dwells after a special manner in certain beings by his energy, we could not, at the same time, maintain that his providence and government, his preserving and directing agency, extend over all; which, however, we must necessarily affirm if we acknowledge God to be the Preserver and Governor of all. We must accordingly find some such formula as is suited, in general, to designate the peculiar relation of moral fellow-

* Allusion to Hebrews ix. 14. So, too, he explained 1 Timothy iii. 16.

† Collat. IV. c. vi., vii., xiii.

‡ See the fragments of Diódorus in the work of Leontius of Byzantium, l. c. f. 700.

ship and communion in which God stands with those rational beings who are fitted for it by the temper of their minds, in contradistinction from others who by their sins exclude themselves from such communion. And that formula is as follows:—God is peculiarly near to such by virtue of his complacency in them; by virtue of his disposition towards them; by virtue of the direction of his will; by his favour, inasmuch as he has adopted them as his children.”* Theodore compared also Christ’s baptism with the baptism of believers, as that which was prefigured by his own; affirming that, from this moment, the effects of that special union with God became manifest in him; but with this difference; that to him was imparted the entire fulness of the Divine Spirit, while believers received *through him* only partial influences of the same Spirit.† Here, as in many other places, Theodore seems to assert, that to the Saviour, something new, which had not been in him before, was imparted to him from without; a view, however, which is at variance with the opinion he elsewhere expressed respecting an original union of the divine Logos with the man Jesus; unless perhaps he meant to say, that this communication of the fulness of the divine Spirit, seeming to come to him from without, was but an effect resulting from his hidden union with the divine Logos.

Although Theodore after this manner compared the being of God in Christ with the being of God in sanctified and enlightened men, yet it was by no means his purpose to establish here a *perfect sameness of kind* in all respects, but only to place in a prominent light the sameness of kind in a certain respect, in so far as the relation of God to rational beings standing in spiritual communion with him must and should be distinguished from the relation of God to the rest of creation. He affirmed, at the same time, that along with this generic identity there still existed, in the same identical relation in this one respect, a great specific diversity. And here regard

* Κατ’ εὐδοκίαν, in allusion to the divine voice at the baptism of Christ. Luke iii. 22. Κατὰ διαβίαν, κατὰ θελήσιν, κατὰ χάριν, καὶ νόθεσίαν, l. c. f. 700, which in the Latin is in general translated *adoptio*. Hence the controversy, at a later period, about adoptionism. He moreover referred to the mode in which elsewhere the names God and the Son of God are used metonymically. *Adoptio in baptismo secundum comparationem judaicæ adoptionis*, where he referred to ls. i. 2, v. lxxxii. 6.

† See l. c. fol. 701, col. 1.

should be had to the *different modes and ways* in which God stands related to good men generally, to prophets, to apostles, and last of all to the Son.* These accessory distinctions served to designate the different ways in which God dwells within whatever is generically like him. "Never," says Theodore, "shall we have the folly to assert that the mode in which God dwells in Christ is no other than that in which he dwells in prophets or apostles." After these distinctions the expression Son of God in the sense of Theodore would denote "such a not merely partial but complete union between the being who is by his nature and his essence the Son of God, namely, the Logos, and a man, as that, by virtue of this union, the latter would be made to share in all the honour, glory, and dominion belonging to himself.†

Again, whilst Apollinaris affirmed that two beings, both abiding in their own complete and individual natures, could never be so united as to constitute one,—one person; it was the great purpose of Theodore to show in what way we are to conceive that deity and humanity, while abiding each in its own peculiar essence in Christ, were still bound together by a certain relation in one personal fellowship and unity. Jesus, as the instrument employed by the deity for the purpose of extending abroad his saving influences to all men who are fitted to receive them, was the temple in which God dwelt, and in so far a divinely human person. If we look at the distinction of the deity and the humanity, said he, there we must distinguish from each other two natures, abiding without disturbance, each in its own purity and completeness, and accordingly since both the conceptions are strictly connected, two persons (*ὑποστάσεις προσώπα*). But if we look at their union in the above-mentioned relation, we must speak of Christ as a person in whom, as one, the human nature has been taken up into fellowship with the divine.‡ This he illustrates by

* Where, namely, this expression, "Son of God," was taken in the highest sense; for Theodore in this respect also did admit that there might be a different application of the term, where nothing more was to be denoted by it than simply the union with God generally. See the preceding note.

† L. c. 700, col. 2.

‡ L. c. Concil. V. Collat. IV. 29. Quando naturas discernimus, perfectam naturam Dei verbi dicimus et perfectam personam, nec enim sine persona est subsistentiam dicere perfectam, perfectam autem et hominis naturam et personam similiter.

comparing it with the case in which man and wife are, in a *certain* relation, called one body; Eph. v. Thus Theodore contradicted what constituted the prevailing doctrine, not only in the Alexandrian church, but also in other churches.* It may be said, indeed, that the church phraseology relating to the distinction between the terms *ὑπόστασις*, *πρόσωπον*, and *οὐσία*, was not as yet duly settled: but the reason why Theodore deemed it necessary to suppose that in a certain respect two hypostases were united in Christ, lay still deeper than in this unsettled character of the church phraseology: it was connected with the whole peculiarity of his mode of apprehension.

As we already remarked, in describing the doctrine of Apollinaris, the latter employed the interchangeableness of the predicates belonging to the two natures (the *ἀντιμεθίστασις τῶν ὀνομάτων*) as a character to define the unity of the God-man. But Theodore contended against this unconditional transfer itself as bringing along with it a perfect entanglement and confusion of conceptions.† He was himself also for allowing, indeed, of a certain transfer of predicates, to mark the union of the deity and humanity in Christ; but this only when the different relations of the same predicate was expressly defined, according as they were employed to denote either the being who, in his essence, is the Son of God, or the man who, through the divine favour, was exalted to Sonship with God, by being taken into union with the essential Son of God. Accordingly, he said, the Virgin Mary might, in different senses, be called *θεότοκος* and *ἀνθρωπότοκος*;—the latter in accordance with the nature of the fact; the former in view of a certain relation, and in so far as God dwelt, after the manner described, in the man who was born of her.‡

The opposite tendency as to the mode of apprehending and developing this doctrine we find in the Alexandrian church. Owing to the mystical contemplative bent which predominated in that church, the chief endeavour there was, to set prominently forth the mystery, the incomprehensible, transcendent, and inexplicable fact of the union of the deity and humanity, by the very forms of phraseology chosen to express this doc-

* As the Cappadocian church-teachers had declared, in the Apollinarian controversy, that in respect to the difference of the deity and humanity in Christ, we may say indeed, *ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο*, but not *ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος*.

† Concil. V. l. c. 8.

‡ Leontius, l. c. 703, col. 1.

trine, and to oppose every attempt at explanation. The *ἔνωσις τῶν φύσεων ἀφραστός, ἀπερινοήτος,* ἀρρήτος* and *ὑπὲρ λόγον*—"the ineffable, incomprehensible, transcendent union of natures,"—such was the *watchword* of the Alexandrian church doctrine. Since the church-teachers of this tendency, of whom we may regard the bishop Cyrill of Alexandria as the representative, sought by their doctrinal formulas to give particular prominence to the mystery of the appearance and existence of *one Christ* in the united deity and humanity, they were very ready to transfer the human predicates to the divine essence, and the divine to the human. They were fond of such paradoxical expressions as "God has suffered for us: Mary is the Mother of God (*ἡ Θεότοκος*); Mary bore in the body the Word which was made flesh." Because they used such expressions, however, they ought by no means to be charged with holding notions whereby the divine and human natures were confounded, and transformed into each other. They guarded expressly against being so misunderstood by always holding distinctly apart the divine and the human predicates (*τὰ ἀνθρώπινα* and *τὰ Θεοπρέπη*); also by acknowledging the independence of both in their union, and by explaining that the predicates of both kinds were to be attributed to the one Word who became man, but in different senses—the one with reference to his deity, the other with reference to the humanity which he assumed. Only we ought no longer to distinguish, in the actual case, two natures to which these different attributes belonged, but ascribe both classes of attributes alike, though not in the same sense, to one and the same Logos who became man. One and the same Son of God miraculously consists of two natures mysteriously united.* Since, moreover, the Egyptian theologians, strangers as they were to all intentional Docetism, received all the phenomena which they found presented in the gospel history into their conception of Christ; since, accordingly, they referred to him the expressions of anguish at the approach of death, and also his asseverations of ignorance with respect to many things, regarding these as the marks of humanity, they could agree, on this side, in individual results, with the other party; but

* *Ἐἰς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς υἱὸς ἐκ δυοῖν πραγμάτων εἰς ἓν τὸ ἐξ ἀμορφῶν ἀπορήτως ἐκπεφηνός.*

the difference between the two dogmatic tendencies manifested itself in their peculiar way of explaining these facts.

The Egyptian scheme of doctrine placed in this the incomprehensible mystery, that divine omniscience and human ignorance, human suffering, human sensibility, and divine exemption from suffering, and in general, divine and human attributes co-existed in one and the same Christ. The supernatural side (*ὑπὲρ λόγον, ὑπὲρ φύσιν*) was precisely the one which they were for chiefly insisting upon. The Antiochian theologians, on the other hand, presumed indeed in no wise to derive and explain the existence and appearance of Christ from the ordinary course of the development of human nature. They acknowledged here, in common with the Alexandrians, such a communication of God as could only be an object of faith; but yet they did not confine themselves within the same narrow limits which the latter had set up in their endeavours to bring these phenomena under distinct and definite conceptions of the understanding. Comparing the life of Christ, as it appeared in its manifestation, with the course of development of human nature generally, and with the great end of Christ's appearance on earth, they sought to point out what was in harmony with nature in the revelation of the supernatural; to trace, in connection with the *ὑπὲρ λόγον*, also the *κατὰ λόγον*. Along with this difference went another, namely, that the Antiochian theologians endeavoured to find something analogous to the union of God with man in Christ in the relation of God to rational beings generally; to find a point of comparison between the being of God in Christ and the being of God in believers; while, on the other hand, the Alexandrian theologians endeavoured to give distinctness and prominence to those points alone in which the union of God and humanity in Christ differed entirely from every other kind of union into which God enters with man, and looked upon all those comparisons and analogies as tantamount to a denial of the divine dignity of the Redeemer, as tending to obscure, or even totally to subvert, the doctrine of the God-man. He who affirmed that God used the man Jesus as an instrument, that he dwelt in him as in a temple, seemed to them to acknowledge no other being of God in Christ than might be affirmed in the case of all enlightened and sanctified men,—such, for example, as Moses and the pro-

phets; and so also, he who spoke of a *συναφεία κατὰ χάριν, κατ' εὐδοκίαν*, etc. They did not consider that these several expressions might be used in a quite different sense from their own, and so they really were used by the theologians of the other party. The Alexandrians, it is true, had in their favour, so far as it concerned the last-mentioned formula, the prevailing doctrinal terminology. The peculiar doctrinal terminology of the Antiochian school was in this case closely connected, however, with the whole of their system,—particularly with its peculiar doctrine of man; but for this very reason they could, in fairness and justice, be judged only by reference to their own connection of ideas, and the relation of their doctrinal language to their doctrinal conceptions. So that theory of a *συναφεία κατὰ χάριν*, or *κατ' εὐδοκίαν, κατ' αὐθεντίαν, κατ' ἡξίαν*—all which expressions, taken in their own (the Alexandrians') sense, could denote nothing else than a certain spiritual, moral fellowship, at highest a deification of human nature,—to this theory the Alexandrians had nothing to oppose, but the assertion of a *ἔνωσις φυσικῇ, κατ' οὐσίαν, οὐσιώδης*, as they would recognize in the *Christ* who appeared, only the one nature of the incarnate Word, or the one incarnate nature of the Word (*μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένον*, or *μία φύσις—σεσαρκώμενη*). But the Antiochians, who likewise proceeded only on the groundwork of *their own* connection of ideas and their own dogmatic terminology, could under these latter definitions conceive of nothing else than a confusion and transformation of the two natures, resulting in a third.

It is manifest, then, from what has been said, how easily the two positions might be held in direct opposition to each other; how easily those at the one might see dangerous heresies in the assertions which proceeded from those at the other. Had men traced back to its deepest ground the difference at bottom, in the relation of the two dogmatic tendencies to each other, they would have come to perceive and to make themselves conscious that there existed here a radical difference in the mode of apprehending the relation between the natural and the divine—the relation between reason and revelation; as, in fact, appears evident in the relation of the *ὑπὲρ λόγον* to the *κατὰ λόγον*. But to such clearness of insight the consciousness of dogmatic oppositions did not, in this period, easily unfold itself. Men were rather disposed to

remain fast by the accidental expression or utterance of oppositions in their outward form of manifestation, just where they laid strongest hold on the church interest, without seeking to make themselves clearly conscious of the underlying root of the antagonism. Besides this, the contest here between the two opposite types of doctrine sprung out of the use of a single term, to which just then the church interest attached peculiar importance, and, owing to the manner in which the controversy arose, it so happened that the dogmatic development was from the outset disturbed by the intrusion of profane, personal feelings; and the evolution of the great points of opposition which lay at the root of the disputes on particular questions, was hindered by the confounding of matters belonging to Christian life with those belonging to the development of dogmatic conceptions, as well as by the interference of outward secular power.

The circumstances which led to the outbreak of the controversy were as follows:—Nestorius, a presbyter of the church at Antioch, esteemed and celebrated on account of the rigid austerity of his life and the impressive fervour of his preaching, had, in the year 428, been made patriarch of Constantinople. Educated in the convent, he had brought with him the virtues and the faults usually connected with Monasticism. With an honest and pious zeal, he failed to unite prudence and moderation: his zeal was readily alloyed with passion: he was apt to see dangerous heresies in anything remote from the dogmatic phraseology to which he was accustomed. He did not always know how to unite the spirit of love and forbearance with zeal for the truth of which he was assured. As it was often the case with those who left the discipline of the cloister to act a part on the great stage of public life, that, by the constraint and awkwardness of their movements, they gave frequent occasion of offence; so it happened with Nestorius, when suddenly transferred from a quiet scene of activity into the most perplexing relations, near a corrupt court, where every species of intrigue and passion was busily at work, and into the midst of a clergy who were governed, many of them, rather by worldly than spiritual motives. Here he became an object of jealousy to many foreign ecclesiastics who were residing near the court, and who had aspired after the patriarchal dignity, as well as to the patriarch of Alexandria, who would fain be

the primate of the Oriental church. Amidst such relations, Nestorius, in order to sustain himself, and to exert a healthful influence, needed to unite to firmness of character, Christian prudence, moderation, and wisdom ; but in *these* very virtues he was lamentably deficient.

He wished to make the first trial of his patriarchal power in suppressing the various descriptions of heretics, who, in spite of all the laws against them, had continued to spread in the capital of the East, and in its subordinate dioceses.* Spiritual pride, no less than a blind persecuting zeal, spoke forth in those words of his inaugural discourse addressed to the emperor :—"Give me a country purged of all heretics, and, in exchange for it, I will give you heaven. Help me to subdue the heretics, and I will help you to conquer the Persians." There was no lack, indeed, of those who were delighted with this zeal of their new patriarch for the purity of the faith ; but neither were there wanting men of more prudent views, to whom a beginning of this sort augured unfavourably. Correspondent to this beginning was the direction which the active labours of the new patriarch first took, when, without any discrimination of essentials or non-essentials in doctrinal disputes, he proceeded to persecute with like zeal Arians, Novatians, and Quartodecimnians. Much violent excitement of feeling, ending in the effusion of blood, was thus occasioned by him ; but it was not long before his polemic zeal brought down the charge of heresy upon himself.

Nestorius, if he was not himself a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia, yet belonged, as his doctrine concerning the person of Christ evinces, among the disciples of the Antiochian doctrine ; and, being devoted to this, he might be very quick to discern important heresies in everything that conflicted with the leading conceptions of his own scheme. On this side he could not fail to be frequently scandalized under the new circumstances in which he was placed ; for here he

* The church-historian, Socrates, who must be our principal authority in depicting the character of Nestorius, and who is the least prejudiced of any who have described him, might indeed be led astray in his judgments of him, through partiality for the Novatians, whom Nestorius persecuted ; but, on the other hand, he appears free, in his judgments, from the fanaticism of his times ; as is evident in those remarks which tend to the disparagement of Nestorius.

encountered many phrases in the prevailing language of the church which seemed altogether repugnant to the Antiochian system of doctrine. To this class belonged particularly the title *Θεότοκος* as applied to the virgin Mary; a title to which the prevailing veneration of Mary attached peculiar importance; and this excessive veneration of Mary itself, which such a title served to encourage, might also contribute with other causes to make its use appear dangerous to Nestorius, who had received in the Antiochian school a purer direction of the Christian spirit.*

As it was not customary in those times to separate what belonged to scholastic divinity from the topics more appropriate to the sermon, it was natural that Nestorius, whose rhetorical manner, modelled after the Antiochian taste, was peculiarly grateful to many of the Constantinopolitans, and whose sermons were received with loud exclamations of applause and clapping of hands,† should soon feel impelled to introduce into them a doctrinal theme which appeared to him so important. It may perhaps, however, be ascribed to his prudence, that he did not at once enter the lists against a term which stood in such high veneration, but contented himself to teach in general the doctrine concerning the union of the two natures in Christ, according to the system of Theodore of Mopsuestia. ‡ When

* Socrates is, in one respect, more just towards Nestorius than the great body of his contemporaries, and the dominant party in the church, during several of the following centuries, in that he defends him against the charge of Photinianism and of Samosaténianism. But in another respect he does him injustice, adopting a false view of these controversies which came to be entertained at a later period, after Nestorius had been factiously stigmatized as a heretic, and charging him with having fostered the controversy about a mere word, from want of accurate knowledge of the language and literature of the ancient church, from obstinacy and from vanity. He was afraid of the word *Θεότοκος* as of a ghost (*ὡς τὰ μαρμαρυγία*.) From the remarks already made respecting the general dogmatic antagonism out of which this controversy arose, it is evident, that although the dispute here was about a word, yet it was by no means a mere verbal dispute; but a far deeper and more general opposition of views was the real source of the controversy. If it had so happened, however, that this particular term had not been drawn into the dispute, the controversy doubtless would not have proved at once so violent and acrimonious.

† As appears evident from various allusions in his sermons. See *e. g.* Sermo II. in the works of Marius Mercator, T. II. near the beginning.

‡ That this preceded the public outbreak of the controversy is apparent from what Nestorius himself says, in a sermon delivered after the

Nestorius expounded the Antiochian system of doctrine in his discourses, others of less considerate zeal, who were attached to his person, might feel themselves called upon to commence the attack upon the name *Θεότοκος*, now commonly applied to the virgin Mary. His presbyter Anastasius, who had come with him from Antioch, and enjoyed his particular confidence, was, on a certain occasion,* prompted to exclaim in one of his discourses, "Let no man call Mary the mother of God; for she was human, and God cannot be born of man."† This onset, though it sprang out of a well-meant pious zeal, was still extremely ill-timed and unwise. The term which he attacked had on its side the authority of ancient use, not only in the Egyptian church, but also in other respectable churches; many eminent church teachers had already employed it, without associating with its use the errors aimed at by Anastasius. But by the way in which he attacked it, he would necessarily expose himself, according to the then prevailing method of doctrinal strife, to the reproach of having denied

controversy had begun: *Μεμνήσθε δὲ πον πάντος καὶ τὰ πολλαὶς μοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰρημνεία, τὰς διπλὰς πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν διακρίνοντι φύσεις.* L. c. p. 9, init. The Quartodecimanians in Asia Minor, who were induced, by his influence, to join themselves to the catholic church, were persuaded by him also to subscribe the creed which he had brought with him from the Antiochian church, which Theodore of Mopsuestia had drawn up for the use of catechumens and converted heretics, and in which his peculiar system of doctrines was clearly unfolded. See Concil. Ephes. act. vi. f. 1515, T. I. Harduin. * Socrat. Vñ. 32.

† It is nothing strange, that the reports differ as to the immediate occasion of the disputes. Various circumstances, following one after the other, may have co-operated to kindle the flame; and then the question comes up, which was the first. The report of Socrates seems on the whole to present the order of events in their most natural connection. According to the account of Theophanes, in his Chronography, Nestorius himself first brought on the dispute, by a sermon composed by himself (the same which Socrates ascribes to Anastasius), which he placed in the hands of his *Synkel* (episcopal secretary) directing him to read it in the church. This secretary, according to Theophanes, was not Anastasius. Supposing the fact to have been so, we may conclude that this sermon was the first in the series of those which have been preserved by Marius Mercator; for in this discourse something resembling the expressions quoted in the text is unquestionably to be found. But still this amounts to no proof; for, in sermons which continually refer to this subject, many things would naturally be repeated. Socrates is here certainly a more important authority than Theophanes, who wrote four centuries later.

the true deity of Christ, of having taught that Jesus was born of Mary as a mere man, and then, in some after period, visited—like other prophets and divine messengers, whom he differed from only in degree—with the influences of the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, it is said that a bishop of Marcianopolis in Mœsia,* who was just then on a visit to Constantinople, publicly exclaimed in the church, either while addressing an assembly of bishops in the sacarium, or more probably in a sermon, "Let him be accursed who calls Mary the mother of God;" but Cyrill wrongly infers, because Nestorius did not contradict this declaration, and because he afterwards admitted this bishop to the communion, that he approved of what he had said. Nestorius might certainly acknowledge the bishop as an orthodox man, and respect his zeal for pure doctrine, though he may not have approved the way in which he chose to express it.

• After this public declaration, the question whether Mary ought to be called the mother of God was much agitated, not only among the clergy at Constantinople, but among the laity, who were so addicted to doctrinal discussions;† and the disputes were carried on with heat and violence on both sides. Nestorius thought it his duty to take an active part in these disputes, and to defend the cause of his friend, who was stigmatized as a heretic. He often brought up this subject in his sermons. In the first of these he began with setting forth the evidences of a Providence consulting for the wants of mankind in the kingdom of nature, which evidences he drew from the marks of benevolent adaptation; but with a very superficial conception of the principle, the whole being referred merely to the gratification of sensuous wants. Then, by a quite disproportionate leap, he proceeded next to consider the greatest gift which God has bestowed on mankind, in the appearance of Christ, whose end was to restore the fallen image of God. The restoration of mankind was to be brought about

* Cyrill of Alexandria, the fierce antagonist of Nestorius, and whose testimony, therefore, cannot be wholly relied on, reports this in several public declarations; *e. g.* ep. 6. But the truth of this assertion is contradicted on no side; and what Cyrill relates may well be supposed to have taken place through the blind zeal of a bishop of this party.

† According to the narrative of Theophanes it was an advocate (σχολᾶστικὸς) of Constantinople, who first came out publicly in the church, against a sermon in which the epithet *θεότοκος* was attacked.

by the instrumentality of a man, in proof of which he adduced 1 Cor. xv. 12. On this last proposition he evidently intended to lay great stress, with a view to the immediate application of it against those who were unwilling to call Mary the mother of a man, but who insisted that she was the mother of God. Unjustly charging such with his own inferences from their doctrine, he put them in the same class with pagans, who gave mothers to their gods. Him who was born of Mary, he, on the other hand, calls the instrument of the Deity, the temple prepared through Mary by the Holy Spirit, in which the divine Logos dwelt. Everywhere in these discourses he adheres strictly to the formulas of the Antiochian school. He teaches that there were two natures, deity and humanity, united together after the most intimate manner; but from the first, in connection with the duality of natures, there was but one dignity,* the human nature being, in this respect, exalted, by virtue of that intimate union, to a participation in the dignity of the divine. Hence one Christ, one son of God, inasmuch as the humanity had been taken up into union with the one eternal Son of God. He spoke, as we might anticipate from the above remarks, with great heat and injustice against the antagonists of the Antiochian scheme of doctrine, whom he called sophistical dogmatists of the new school.† He places the doctrine of a most intimate union between humanity and deity over against the doctrine of a deification of human nature, of which he accuses his opponents. ‡

This controversy excited so much interest, even among the laity, that, on a certain occasion, when Nestorius was inveighing against the doctrine which represented Mary as the mother of God, and contrasting the eternal generation of the Logos with the temporal nativity of *the man* whom the Logos assumed as his instrument, an individual of rank, no longer able to restrain himself, cried out, "No; the eternal Logos himself condescended also to the second birth." Immediately a violent commotion arose among the assembled multitude—one party taking the side of the patriarch, the other that of his opponent. § Nestorius did not allow himself to be embarrassed by this incident. He once more resumed his discourse, praised

* Ἀξία, αὐθεντία μοναδική.

† Τοὺς σοφοὺς τῶν δογματιστῶν τῶν νωτέρων.

‡ Ἀρχα συναφία, οὐκ ἀπαθώς.

§ Opp. Marii Mercator. T. II. f. 13.

the zeal of his friends, and, having refuted the sudden opponent, whom he called a poor miserable trifler,* proceeded on with the discussion after his usual manner.

Already had Nestorius incurred, in the opinion of many, the charge of Photinianism,† when a man who, on account of his personal relations, might well be suspected of being governed by unholy passions and motives, took advantage of the popular feeling now rising against the patriarch, and laboured to excite it still more—coming out publicly, though without naming him, as his opponent, and in a way which was well suited to produce in the minds of many an unfavourable impression against Nestorius. This person was Proclus, who had been offered as a bishop to the church at Cyzicus, but had not been received as such. He had ever since resided in the Eastern capital, and at an earlier period sought to obtain the vacant patriarchate at Constantinople, with some hopes of success. On the Christmas festival of the year 429, or on the festival of the Annunciation (*ἡμερα εὐαγγελίσμου*) on the 25th of March,‡ he preached a discourse full of rhetorical display and exaggeration, in which, extolling the Virgin Mary as the mother of the incarnate Logos, he attacked those who refused to acknowledge her as such, without calling their names, and noticed in particular the objections which had been offered by Nestorius in the first sermon above mentioned. As, by his hints and allusions, he gave it to be understood that his opponents believed only in a deified man, instead of believing in a humanized Logos—as he held them up to view as enemies to the

* *Τῆς τοῦ δειλαίου μισαρίας ὁ ἐλέγχος.*

† He had heard of this accusation, but considered it unworthy of refutation, because they could not touch his doctrine in that way. *Ego autem quibusdam mihi et illud renuntiantibus, cum lætitia sæpius risi quoniam, inquit, episcopus, quæ Photini sunt, sapit.*

‡ All that Proclus says, in this homily, is unquestionably suited to the second festival, concerning the celebration of which in this church during the present period, we have, however, no other account besides this. As elsewhere, in the homilies of the Greek fathers, many things connected with the nativity and childhood of Christ are taken together, so this discourse might be understood also as having reference to the Christmas festival, and possibly Proclus, for the express purpose of doing honour to Mary, may have converted this festival itself into a *παροῖνική πανήγυρις*. What he says about the great multitude who had come by land and by water, to attend the celebration of this festival, would rather lead us to conclude that it was the great Christian festival of Christmas.

honour of Mary—all this could not fail with many to operate very unfavourably for the party of Nestorius. The tinkling chime of high-wrought phrases, and the cause which he defended, the honour of Mary, procured for the sermon—though, from the peculiar character of the style, it must have been unintelligible to many—immense approbation, as was testified by the loud applause with which, according to the usual practice, it was received. All this having transpired in the presence of Nestorius, and himself understanding full well all the allusions in the discourse, he felt himself called upon to defend his doctrine against these reproaches; and hence on the spot he addressed a short discourse to the church, such as the moment suggested to him, and in which, therefore, the good temper he showed in refraining from all personal attack on his opponent deserves to be more particularly remarked. He began with great prudence, declaring that it was perfectly natural that they should receive with so great approbation what had been said to the honour of Mary; “but,” he added, “we must take heed lest, in doing honour above measure to the Virgin Mary, we run the hazard of detracting from the dignity of the divine Logos.” With allusion to the swollen language of Proclus, so ill suited to the understanding of the people, he said he would endeavour to speak with plainness, so as to be understood by all. He concluded by exhorting them not to express their approbation at once by clapping, not to suffer themselves to be carried away by the charm of oratory, but to examine with care into the doctrine, and refrain from condemning what was true, merely because it was new to them. Immediately after this he preached several discourses, in which he expounded the questions still further with special reference to the objections of Proclus. He was aware how much foresight he needed to use so as to give no offence where there was such an enthusiastic veneration of Mary. He was ready to respect this feeling, yet without yielding anything from the truth. He declared that, in case any of the simpler minded were disposed to call the Virgin Mary the mother of God (Θεότοκος), he had no particular aversion to the term, provided they did not convert Mary into a goddess.* Adopting the middle course between the two extremes, instead of

* Ἐμοί πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν φθόνος οὐκ ἔστι, μόνον μὴ ποιῶ τὴν παρθένον θεῶν. S. V. l. c. 30.

using the phrases *Mary the mother of God*, or the mother of the man (*θεότοκος*, or *ἀνθρωπότοκος*), he employed the term mother of Christ (*χριστότοκος*), inasmuch as the name Christ belonged to the whole person, uniting the divine and the human natures. His endeavour to keep close to the holy scriptures appears worthy of all respect. He very justly offers it as an argument against the use of that term, that the holy scriptures nowhere teach that God, but everywhere that *Jesus Christ*, the Son of God, the Lord, was born of Mary. "This we all acknowledge; for unhappy is his case who receives not what the scriptures teach." His painstaking conscientiousness, in refusing to yield anything from the truth, may be seen in the following example. He had said, "I do not grudge that epithet to the mother of *Christ*. I know that she is worthy of all honour whom God assumed into himself, through whom the Lord of the universe passed, through whom the Sun of righteousness shone." These words, which favoured the worship of the Virgin, and seemed coincident with the prevailing notions, were received with claps of approbation. This made Nestorius fearful lest his language might have been so understood as to conflict with the scheme of doctrine which he had ever taught; and therefore he immediately added, "Your applause makes me suspicious.* How have you understood my declaration—through whom the Lord of the universe passed? In that I said not the same as if I had used the words, 'He was born of her;†' for I do not so soon forget my own language," &c.†

Meanwhile everything at Constantinople was tending towards a schism of the church. One party of the clergy and monks, affecting to regard him as a heretic, a follower of the doctrines of Paul of Samosata, would no longer recognize him as their bishop, and renounced all church fellowship with him.‡ A card was publicly affixed to the walls of the principal church, containing a detailed comparison of the doctrines of Nestorius with those of Paul of Samosata.§ Several presbyters preached

* Nestorius, to his honour be it said, seems everywhere to have been averse to these loud theatrical demonstrations of applause. He says here: Πάλιν ὑποσπένει τὸν κρότον—and on another occasion, where doubtless he had been received with loud exclamations of applause, he says, I do not judge the love you bear me by your shouts, οὐ κραυγαῖς κρίνω τὴν εἰς ἐμεῖ φιλοστοργίαν. S. II. fol. 8.

† S. V. f. 31.

‡ See the petition of the Diaconus Basilus, and the monks associated with him, in Harduin. Concil. T. I. f. 1335.

§ L. c. f. 1271.

in one of the churches of Constantinople against the doctrines of Nestorius. He forbade their preaching. Some of the clergy, who were hostile to him, were deposed from their places, as favourers of Manicheism, by a synod convened under his presidency at Constantinople.* On that principle of charging opponents with all imaginable consequences from their doctrines, in which both parties equally indulged, it had probably been inferred from the manner in which the clergy, in accordance with the Egyptian scheme, had expressed themselves in speaking of the human nature of Christ, that they denied the reality of Christ's humanity, and had therefore fallen into the Manicheian Docetism. In view of the remarks already made respecting the character of Nestorius, we must admit there may have been some ground for the accusations of his opponents, inclined though they were to indulge everywhere in extravagant statements, that in the heat of controversy he sometimes forgot himself so far as to resort to violent measures. But we should remember also how sorely he was provoked by fanatical and arrogant opponents, who showed not the least respect for law or order. Once, when Nestorius was about to enter the church for the purpose of preaching a discourse from the Bema, a monk boldly placed himself in the way to stop him, because heretics should not be allowed to teach in public. His adversaries,† who relate this story themselves, call this disorderly behaviour by no severer name, indeed, than the zeal of a pious simplicity; but they really had no reason to complain, when such a disturber of the public peace was harshly dealt with and banished from Constantinople. On another occasion Nestorius displayed that spirit of moderation which seeks not to dispute about words, while pure doctrine is seen to be safe. As he had publicly declared in his sermons that he had no objection to the term *Θεότοκος*, in itself considered; so, in opposition to several of the clergy and the monks who had stigmatized him as a heretic, he declared himself ready to concede, that the person who by his nature is the Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, since there is but one Son of God. The last addition shows in what sense he would concede this;

* As Nestorius says himself, in a letter to Cyrill of Alexandria, l. c. f. 1388.

† L. c. Harduin. 1338.

namely, since the true and essential Son of God had appropriated to himself human nature, and taken it up into union with his own dignity, so that there is but one Son of God, the predicates of the human nature might therefore, in this point of view, be attributed to the one Son of God. Had these persons rightly understood the remark of Nestorius, in its connection with his own scheme of doctrine, they would not have accused him of deception.* The adversaries of Nestorius at Constantinople, at a time when he still possessed full influence at the imperial court, and stood united with the ruling power, would hardly have ventured to come out so boldly against him, unless they had been sure of another powerful support, by virtue of their connection with Cyrill the patriarch of Alexandria, through whose sympathy and participation it was that consequences of a still more extensive and general nature flowed from this controversy.

To form a correct judgment of the several steps, from the beginning, which Cyrill took in this matter, it will be necessary first to glance at the disposition and character of the man, and at the course of conduct he had exhibited since his entrance on the episcopal office. A violent persecuting spirit against pagans, Jews, and heretics, an unbounded ambition, which did not scruple to resort to force and to political means for the sake of securing its ends,† were the traits of character which Cyrill had thus far unfolded.‡ A man of his stamp must have been attracted by an opportunity so inviting, of extending the dominion which he exercised in the Egyptian church over a still wider field. In contemplating by themselves the first steps taken by Cyrill in this contest, we might be led to conclude that he was actuated by a zeal for pure doctrine, which, though it grew out of an exclusive, dog-

* The language of Nestorius, as quoted by his accusers (Harduin. l. f. 1338), was: *Περὶ τοῦ φύσει υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπέχθη ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγίας Μαρίας τῆς Θεότοκου, ἵνα (οὐκ) ἐνὶ ἄλλῳ υἱός.* It is plain that, with Tillemont, we must here supply the *οὐκ* inserted within the brackets; since for the very reason that Nestorius acknowledged but one Son of God in the united deity and humanity, he was willing also in this regard to admit the term *Θεότοκος*, rightly understood.

† Vid. Socrat. VII. 7.

‡ It was also rumoured of Cyrill, that bishoprics could be obtained of him for money by persons wholly unworthy of the office. See Isidor Pelusiot. l. II. ep. 127.

matical spirit, and was exceedingly narrow, was yet untainted by personal passions; that in the outset he did really seek, by gently pointing out where Nestorius was wrong, to convince and change the mind of his fellow-bishop, who, in his opinion, had given just cause of offence to many; and, in so concluding, we should not attach overmuch importance to his abusive interpretation of his opponent's principles—a practice which we find to have been no less common with the other party. But when we compare these steps of Cyrill with his character as previously exhibited; when we follow them in their measured and gradual progress to the final results—it becomes quite probable that he commenced so gently only because the reigning influence of the patriarch of Constantinople was at first too strong for him; and that he meant to prepare with cunning policy the more decided steps which were to follow in due time.

Soon after the breaking out of the disputes at Constantinople, Cyrill took part in them by publishing two works of his own, in which, however, he refrained wholly from alluding to the name or the person of Nestorius. One of these was a programme referring to the approaching Easter festival,* which, conformably to the usage of the Alexandrian bishops, he issued just before the commencement of the fasts. It being customary on such occasions to treat such topics of faith or morals as were adapted to the season, Cyrill chose for his topic on this occasion the peculiar character of Christ, the God-man, as compared with all other divine messengers and prophets—the doctrine of the union of the deity and humanity in Christ.† Next, he took up the same doctrinal subject in a long admonitory letter, addressed, after the Easter festival, to the Egyptian monks. In both these writings he carried out the distinction between an essential and natural union, and a barely relative, moral communion of God with humanity. He represented the transfer of predicates, and hence also the designation of Mary with the title *Θεότοκος*, to be a necessary consequence of the former: he laboured to show that, unless

* *Libellus paschalis, γράμματα πάσχαλα*. Among the works of Cyrill, these letters appear under the name of homilies (*ὁμιλίαι*), perhaps because they answered the twofold purpose of being read before the Alexandrian church, and of being sent to other Egyptian churches.

† The 17th among his homiliæ paschales.

the former were adopted with all the consequences which flowed from it, Christ would be represented as a mere man, whom God employed like other men as an instrument; and that accordingly Christ could not be the Redeemer of mankind. In his second work, Cyrill expressly states the reason why he deemed it necessary to address this letter to the monks. Evil reports, he said, had got among them;* and people were abroad, who sought to disturb their simple faith, by starting such questions as whether Mary ought to be called *Θεότοκος* or not. He observed, in the first place, very justly, that it were better if these persons (who had no call whatever to teach, and who for the most part were wholly destitute of any regular education) would abstain altogether from such questions, and not agitate anew those matters which even the best cultivated minds could scarcely contemplate as seen through a glass darkly. This reason surely ought to have prevented Cyrill himself from writing his letter; but he supposed that, inasmuch as such questions had already begun to be agitated among them, it was necessary to furnish them with the means of refuting the sophisms of their opponents, and of securing their own faith against these assaults. But among the Egyptian monks, who were wholly dependent on the authority of the Alexandrian patriarchs, and by their peculiar mode of training were least of all prepared or inclined to receive the Antiochian scheme of doctrine, the danger of being infected by errors which emanated from Constantinople was hardly so great as to call for any extraordinary precautions. Hence it would seem to be evident that Cyrill was not altogether in earnest in what he here said: it may rather have been his express design, instead of suppressing, to foment the dispute, and add to its importance. The Egyptian monks were, in truth, the willing and ready tools of the Alexandrian bishops in their controversies; and Cyrill must undoubtedly have been aware how easily the passions of these people could be excited on matters of this sort.

It would seem, moreover, that, from various quarters, Cyrill was reproached † for having made such an attack on Nestorius,

* *Θεῦλλοι τινὲς χαλῆπαι.*

† See ep. vi. and vii. among his letters. The venerable abbot Isidore of Pelusium, who might properly address Cyrill in a certain tone of authority, wrote to him thus: "Put an end to the dispute, lest

on the ground of mere reports, as he himself had avowed—an attack which, owing to the position maintained by the patriarch of Alexandria in the church, must necessarily create a great sensation. Cyrill now declared that he felt himself called upon to open and expound the pure doctrine in order to set at rest the minds of those who had taken offence at the reported explanations of Nestorius.* He defended himself against the charge of uncharitableness and love of dispute, by alleging what, in such cases, hypocrisy, abusing the sacred name of love, may easily wear on the lips; that he was ready to sacrifice everything to charity, but could yield nothing in matters of faith; that he could not remain silent when scandal had been given to all the churches of the Roman empire; that, by remaining silent under such circumstances, he would incur the charge of a serious dereliction from duty in the sight of God. He also hints at the reasons which induced him, in that address to the monks, to abstain as yet from all personal attacks, and to use language which was still so far from being vehement. He says† that he might justly have pronounced the anathema on every person who refused to call Mary the mother of God; but he had as yet forbore from so doing,‡ for the sake of Nestorius, lest many might say that the *bishop of Alexandria* or the *Egyptian synod* had condemned him. It is easy to see that Cyrill was anxious to avoid the reproach of hunting up heresies under the influence of passion—a reproach to which events still fresh in the memories of all § easily exposed him.

Nestorius must of course have been greatly excited by this letter, soon dispersed abroad, in which the doctrine taught by him was represented as conflicting with the very essence of Christianity—a letter the design and purport of which no one who was acquainted with the incidents at Constantinople could be at any loss to understand, and which put a new weapon

you bring down upon yourself the judgment of God. Let not the punishment which you deem it necessary to inflict on mortal men on account of personal grievances, fall upon the living church. Prepare not the way for perpetual divisions of the church under the pretence of piety." L. I. ep. 370.

* Ep. 6. Σκανδαλισθεῖσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων αὐτοῦ, in the ii. ep. to Nestor. Χαριτίαν ἡγουν ἐξηγήσεων περιφερομένων.

† Ep. vi.

‡ Οὐ πιστοῖκα τούτο ὁ αὐτὸν τίως.

§ In the case of Chrysostom, of which we shall speak hereafter.

into the hands of his antagonists at Constantinople; and the more so, since, from Cyrill's own declaration afterwards, that his address was aimed against the reported scriptural expositions of Nestorius, it was apparent that the above-mentioned discourse first held by Nestorius was the real object of his attack.

When Cyrill learned how much Nestorius had been annoyed by his letter to the monks, he wrote to him personally in justification of himself. It was not *his* letter assuredly, he thought, which had given rise to disturbances on account of the faith; but it was what Nestorius was supposed to have said, whether he had said it or not. There were many, he affirmed, who were ready to deny that they could any longer call Christ God, or anything more than an instrument of the Deity. How could he (Cyrill) remain silent when injury was done to the faith, and so many were disturbed? * Would he not have made himself answerable for his untimely silence before the judgment-seat of Christ? Indeed, what was he to do now? Cyrill hypocritically represented the matter as if he were desirous of consulting with Nestorius himself as to how he should act, since he had been inquired of by the Roman bishop Cœlestin and by a Roman synod, whether the writing dispersed abroad under the name of Nestorius, which had created everywhere great offence, should be considered as his or not. Cyrill says he did not himself know how that writing had been conveyed to Rome, although doubtless he knew all about it. He affected to doubt whether that discourse had really proceeded from Nestorius, although his animadversions on Nestorius in this letter showed clearly enough that he had no doubts on the subject; and although, in case he entertained any, his conduct would only have been the more censurable. Thus, then, Cyrill concludes that Nestorius was bound rather to find fault with himself than with him. It would be his better course to correct what he had said, so as to put an end to the scandal which the whole world had taken. If anything had escaped him, even in oral discourse, which he had occasion to regret, he ought, after mature reflection, to rectify the mistake, and no longer hesitate to call Mary the mother of God.

* It is hardly to be conceived, however, that a sermon of Nestorius should have produced such important effects among Egyptian monks, who were so little capable of being affected by a tendency of this sort.

This letter of Cyrill was of course not calculated to mend or to mitigate the injury he had done to Nestorius; for this very letter, notwithstanding all its assurances of love, contained, in fact, the severest charges which could be alleged against a preacher of the gospel as such. Although Nestorius signified as much in his reply to Cyrill, yet he answered him in a calm and dignified tone. Into the specific matter of Cyrill's letter he forbore to enter at large, but sought only to refute the charges brought against his doctrine in Cyrill's address to the monks, and to retort the same accusations, under another form, upon Cyrill himself. In so doing he indulged himself, it must be allowed, though in a different way, in the same unwarrantable licence which his opponent had taken of misrepresentation and false charges. Instead of entering into Cyrill's train of thought, in holding fast to the expressions, "God was born," "God suffered," and the like, which might flow out of the theory of the transfer of predicates, he accused him of falling into Pagan, Apollinarian, and Arian errors—and, still worse, of representing God as capable of passion. But he was surely right when he said that the sacred scriptures uniformly give such predicates, not to the Godhead, but to Christ, which name designates the union of the two natures. Hence, moreover, it was his opinion, that Mary should be called rather the mother of Christ (χριστότοκος) than the mother of God. After having called upon Cyrill to examine more closely into the doctrine of scripture, so as to perceive this, he ironically thanked him for sympathizing so deeply with those whose peace had been disturbed, and for extending his anxieties even to the affairs in Constantinople. He might rest assured, however, that he had been wrongly informed, perhaps by clergymen of Constantinople like minded with himself; for everything there was in the most favourable condition—the Christian knowledge of his flock daily improving, and the emperor rejoicing in the prosperity of the church. Nestorius could not therefore, at this time, have been aware of any threatening danger. Cyrill did not leave this letter unanswered: he complained, in his reply, of the calumnies of worthless men who dared to criminate him, especially in the councils of the higher officers of state.* He next repeats the

* Τὰς τῶν ἐν τέλει σύνοδους καιρωφυλακοῦντες, μαλίστα. These persons

admonitions of his first letter, unfolds anew his doctrine concerning the union of natures, and defends it against the consequences which Nestorius had drawn from it in his letter.*

For a moment it seemed as if the way was opened for a reconciliation between the two patriarchs, which, could it possibly have been brought about, would have facilitated the suppression, at least for a time, of the controversies now in the bud. A presbyter of the Alexandrian church, by the name of Lampon, came to Constantinople as a mediator of peace; an office which he had probably undertaken of his own accord. Although Nestorius had already determined to break off the correspondence entirely, yet the spirit of Christian love by which Lampon seemed to be actuated, exerted an influence over him which nothing else could have done. Nestorius was persuaded to write one more short letter to Cyrill †—a letter which everywhere breathes sincerity, and in its few words presents a fair image of the writer's heart. "Nothing is of more power," he writes, "than Christian gentleness. By this man's might I have been conquered, for I confess that I am seized with great fear when I perceive in any man the spirit of Christian gentleness; it is as if God dwelt in him." ‡ It may perhaps have been a consequence of this peaceful disposition, then cherished by Nestorius, that the presbyter Anastasius himself, who was the original author of the dispute, made an attempt towards reconciling those members of the clergy at Constantinople who had broken off from fellowship with their patriarch. § But the opposition of the two parties to each other had already gone too far to allow this disposition of Nestorius to be of any long continuance, or such a negotiation to come to any favourable issue.

Cyrill constantly kept up the connection with the party opposed to Nestorius amongst the clergy, monks, and laity at Constantinople. He covertly directed their steps, which could

would naturally be averse to a bishop who was so fond of intermeddling with political affairs. This passage serves to show, moreover, that in the outset Nestorius seemed to have those who were in authority rather in his favour than opposed to him.

* Ep. iv.

† Ep. iii.

‡ Φοβὸν ὁμολογῶ κεπηῆσθαι πολὺν περὶ πάσαν πάντος ἀνδρός χριστιανικὴν ἱπτικίαν, ὡς ἐγκαθήμενον αὐτῇ τὸν θεὸν κεκτημένην.

§ See Cyrill. ep. 8.

easily be done, since doubtless the Alexandrian patriarchs were always accustomed to maintain their agents (ἀποκρισιῶν) near the imperial residence. But, at the same time, so ambitious and violent a man as Cyrill would necessarily have many enemies among his own clergy; and these now sought protection and support from Nestorius. They placed in his hands many charges against their bishop; charges for which the latter, by his arbitrary and violent proceedings, had doubtless given just occasion; and it would seem that these complaints were at first received and entertained at the imperial court. In a person of Cyrill's character, this circumstance would probably create an impression that disappointed vanity and revenge had now led Nestorius to aim at ruining him; but fears for the disposition of the court at Constantinople, which still seemed favourably inclined to Nestorius, would counsel him to prudence. Deserving of notice in this regard is particularly Cyrill's answer to a memorial of the events which had there transpired, sent to him by the clergy who espoused his cause in Constantinople.* Laying it to the charge of Nestorius that he had instigated worthless men to appear as Cyrill's accusers, he says, "Let him know that I have no fear of the journey (to Constantinople), nor of my being able to answer those persons, when it is *the proper time*. For in due course the providence of our Saviour makes use of slight and unimportant things as occasions for assembling a synod, and through its means his church is purified, so that it preserves the noble faith untarnished. But let not the *wretched man* suppose that, even though the persons who by his insti-

* Ep. 5. This remarkable document has come down to us in two different forms, in the Greek and in a Latin translation by Marius Mercator, which last contains a good deal more than the Greek, and sometimes helps to correct the latter, though it must itself also sometimes be corrected by the Greek. According to the superscription, as given by Marius Mercator, this letter of Cyrill was directed to his agents (Apo-criarii) at Constantinople. On the other hand, according to the Greek document, it was directed to the schismatic clergy at Constantinople. At all events, the advice with regard to the petition to the emperor, which had been submitted to Cyrill's inspection, is closely connected with this letter; and this advice assuredly seems much more like that which would be addressed to the clergy of another diocese, who had entered into combination with Cyrill, than to agents taken from his own clerus. It is probable, therefore, that the Greek title is the right

gation would accuse us were more in number and more important than they are, he *is to be judge over us*; for when I come to Constantinople I shall protest against this, and he himself will have to answer for the bad reports which are abroad concerning him." We see from this that the *thought* of Nestorius presiding over a synod, as his judge, was a thing peculiarly intolerable to Cyrill's vanity. Nestorius had been the first to propose a synod to assemble at Constantinople for the purpose of considering these and other matters; but although this proposition had come from his adversaries, yet Cyrill was satisfied with it; for, as it here appears evident, he conceived the hope that by adroit management he should succeed in converting this synod into an instrument for the overthrow of Nestorius and his system. He wrote, therefore, to the above-mentioned ecclesiastics, that everything from the sermons of Nestorius which could be used to his disadvantage, must be carefully preserved *until the proper time*,* unless a change took place in him. Those ecclesiastics had transmitted to him a complaint drawn up in very severe language against Nestorius, and designed for the emperor, in making use of which they wished to follow the judgment of Cyrill. The latter, however, chose to withhold the document, *because he feared an unfavourable impression would be created by its severity*.† He substituted in place of this another memorial, craftily prepared by himself, in which he preferred they should act first, not on the offensive, but on the defensive, against Nestorius. In this instrument they protested against his judicial authority; and, to justify the step, they endeavoured to point out the cause from which the hostility of Nestorius proceeded, which gave them a convenient opportunity for bringing out on this occasion the complaint against his orthodoxy. In case their adversaries persisted in their accusations, they were to appeal to another tribunal. This memorial Cyrill wrote to them was to be delivered only when it should be found necessary. He would himself take the first opportunity to choose certain bishops and monks, wise and pious men, and send them on to Constantinople; for he should

* Ἐπει καὶ ἀλλὰ πολλὰ ἐπισύρονται ἐγκλήματα ἐκ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων αὐτοῦ, φυλακτέονται ἕως καιροῦ.

† ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτεχόιτο ὑμῖν λίγων κατηγορήσατέ μου ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλείως ὡς αἰρετικοῦ.

not rest easy until, as he cantingly expressed it, he had fought out the battle for the salvation of all to the end. Moreover, he was already preparing to write such letters and to *such persons as the case demanded*.*

To create an influence against Nestorius at the court, Cyrill, in the year 429, had written two works, in which he expounded his own views, as above described, and controverted the opinions attributed to Nestorius; but without engaging in any personal attack on Nestorius, or even mentioning his name. One of these works he addressed to the emperor Theodosius II. himself, and to the empress Eudocia; the other to that all-powerful woman, the Augusta Pulcheria,† and to the rest of the emperor's sisters. A passage in the letter hereafter to be noticed, which the emperor sent to Cyrill, might lead us to conjecture that Cyrill had very good and *special* reasons for addressing himself to Pulcheria; that he had been informed, by means of his secret spies at Constantinople, of a misunderstanding, of which perhaps Nestorius himself had been the occasion, between the emperor and his sister, who otherwise possessed so much influence with him; and that he hoped to turn this connection with Pulcheria to the purpose of weakening the court-party which favoured Nestorius: for he is afterwards accused by the emperor of having taken this step, either because he had contrived, in a way unbecoming his station, to get knowledge of the breach between the emperor and his sister, or because he had sought to sow discord between them. And this accusation brought against Cyrill harmonizes with an ancient story, which intimates that Nestorius had incurred the displeasure of Pulcheria, by leading her brother to suspect her of having entered into some illicit connection with one of the nobles of the court.† This supposition is

* Undoubtedly Cyrill understood very well what persons at Constantinople he should address, and how he could best work upon them so as to accomplish his designs at the court. The most instructive explanation of all these points is contained in a letter of his archdeacon and syncell, which we shall have occasion to quote when we come to speak of somewhat later events.

† The obscure passage in Suidas under the words *Pulcheria*. 'Ἡ Πουλχερία τοσούτων ἱμειῖ τὸν Νεστορίον, ὡς τοὺς φιλοῦντας ἐκείνον διαβρύλλειν, ὅτι πορνίαν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτῆς Θεοδοσίον τὸν βασιλῆα διέβαλε Πουλχερίας ὁ Νεστορίος καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἱμειῖτο, ὕλοδορεῖ γὰρ αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν τότε μαγίστερον Παυλίον λεγόμενον. The sense of this passage might,

rendered probable likewise by similar examples in the history of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs.*

It had often been the case before, that the bishops of the contending church parties in the East endeavoured to secure the victory on their side, by forming a connection with the bishops of Rome. To this means Cyrill now resorted. He sent to Cœlestin bishop of Rome a report of the erroneous doctrines taught by Nestorius. It is plain that, in so doing, he took the liberty of making many untrue statements, so as to make it appear to the Orientals that the step had been taken, not of his own free will, but as a matter of necessity. Earlier than this he had complained to Nestorius that his sermons had given great offence at Rome (see above); and he had pretended to ask him what was to be done. But it is evident from the letter of Cyrill, of which we are now speaking, that he was the *first* to write on this occasion, without being asked, to the Roman bishop; for his letter is not a reply to one which he had received. Moreover, it seems to have been Cyrill himself who caused the sermons of Nestorius to be translated, and immediately sent to Rome, where he was the first to make them known. Next, in his letter to John, patriarch of Antioch, he represents the matter as though he had been led first by the report of Nestorius to the Roman bishop, to write to the latter in his own defence; but this statement is utterly at variance with the contents and tone of the letter to the bishop Cœlestin, for Cyrill surely would not have omitted to mention in his own letter that of Nestorius, if his

perhaps, also be construed thus, that Nestorius had accused her brother before the Paulinus there mentioned, of forbidden intercourse with her brother; but this rendering is not so well suited to the collocation of the words as that followed in the text. And had this been the accusation, Theodosius would have been as much excited against Nestorius as Pulcheria was.

* Afterwards, too, it is always to Pulcheria that the merit is ascribed of having especially contributed, by her zeal for the orthodox faith, to bring about the suppression of the Nestorian heresy. The language of the syncell already mentioned, to a bishop of Constantinople, during the later transactions, may serve as an example: *Festina supplicari dominæ ancillæ Dei Pulcheriæ Augustæ, ut iterum ponat animam suam pro Domino Christo*; that is, in behalf of the cause of Cyrill. When Pulcheria reigned with Marcian, the Egyptian bishops, during the first session of the council of Chalcedon, shouted: *Ἡ Αἰγύπτου Νιστορίαν* ~~ἐξέβαλε~~. See Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 74, B.

own had been occasioned by it. This epistle was composed in a style well fitted to win the favourable verdict of a Roman bishop, anxious to establish his authority as judge over the whole church; for he wrote to him that he left it to his decision whether he (Cyrill) ought or ought not to announce to Nestorius the withdrawal from him of the fellowship of the church. He requested him to make known his decision by letters to all the bishops of the East; for this would have for its effect to unite them all together in the defence of the pure doctrine. To the bearer of this letter, a certain deacon Posidonius, Cyrill at the same time entrusted, for the use of the Roman bishop, a brief statement of the main points in which the erroneous doctrines of Nestorius consisted, and a skilful exposition of all that was peculiar and characteristic in the Antiochian system of doctrine; represented, however, only in that particular light in which it must appear to him from his own point of view, and with some unfair conclusions.

As to Nestorius, he too had occasion to write to the Roman bishop, but on another subject, and one, indeed, which was not exactly suited to procure for him a favourable hearing. Four bishops from Italy, deposed in the Pelagian controversies, had some time before taken up their residence in Constantinople. They had complained of the injustice done them, and sought help from the patriarch of Constantinople as well as from the emperor. Nestorius was too much a friend to justice, and of too independent a spirit, to condemn these men at once, without inquiring into the matter. He wished to hear both sides, and therefore reported the affair to the Roman bishop, requesting from him a more exact statement of the facts. He wrote several letters to Rome on this subject, but received no answer; partly perhaps because the Roman bishop, being ignorant of the Greek language, was obliged to wait till the letters could be translated, and partly because the style of the letters may not have been altogether flattering to the Roman pride. In two other letters, which he despatched after these, Nestorius drew up a report of the controversy which had now begun. He spoke here with the same vehemence and injustice of the positions of his opponent as the latter had done with respect to his own doctrines. Yet here too he declared himself ready, though preferring himself to give Mary the title of *χριστότοκος*, to allow that she might be called *θεότοκος*, provided this title

was understood to refer, not to the deity, but to the humanity united with the deity. Very striking, however, is the difference of tone between the letters of Nestorius and those of Cyrill to the Roman bishop. Cyrill addresses him in language which was at least capable of being so understood as if he did concede to him a certain supreme judicial authority over the church. Nestorius speaks to him as one colleague to another, and as a person standing on the same level with himself. This of itself would be sufficient to interest Cœlestin, the Roman bishop, in favour of Cyrill rather than of Nestorius, and to enlist his prejudices against the latter. In addition to this, he had first become acquainted with the doctrines of Nestorius from the representations of Cyrill, the latter having more craftily accompanied his letters with a Latin translation; and it is easy to see that the scheme which had *thus* been explained to him would, from the first, appear to him to detract from the dignity of the God-man.*

Cœlestin decided at a Roman synod that the clergy excommunicated by Nestorius should be received back to the fellowship of the church; and in case Nestorius himself did not present, within ten days after the reception of the sentence pronounced at Rome, a *written recantation*, and testify his agreement with the Roman and Alexandrian church doctrine respecting the birth of Christ, who is our God, he should be excommunicated, and no longer recognized as patriarch. In a letter to Cyrill, full of extravagant praises, he gave to that bishop, by the sovereign authority of the apostolic see, the power of carrying this sentence into execution; and, in case Nestorius refused to furnish the required recantation, of providing at once for the appointment of a new patriarch. This sentence he communicated also to the clergy at Constantinople who had seceded from Nestorius, and to the latter himself with the most vehement reproaches. The Roman bishop here claimed for himself a supreme judicatory authority, which, according

* The doctrine of Nestorius appeared to him to be such, that its author could sometimes consider Christ to be a mere man, and sometimes, whenever he thought fit, ascribe to him unity with God. See the letter of Cœlestin to the clergy of Constantinople. The Roman narrowness betrays itself in his letter to Cyrill, where he charges it upon Nestorius as a crime: 'Ὅτι Χριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν ἐπάγεται ζήτησις περὶ τῆς ἰδίας γενήσεως.

to the then constitution of the church, in nowise belonged to him ; and which Cyrill, unless he had seen that it might be turned to his own advantage, and could not possibly prove injurious to it, would assuredly never have conceded. But, under the present circumstances, this declaration of the Roman bishop was extremely agreeable to Cyrill, as an important means for the attainment of his objects ; for he could make use of this declaration to intimidate the Oriental bishops by the fear of a rupture with the whole Western church ; with which church peace had, but a short time before, been once more restored. This is made manifest in his letter to John, patriarch of Antioch.*

The most eminent and influential bishops of the Eastern provinces of Roman Asia,† who were attached partly to the unaltered system of Theodore, and in part to a very temperate and mild interpretation of the same, looked with alarm at the outbreak of a new schism, which threatened once more to sever from one another the Christian East and West, after the peace of the church had, but a very short time before, by the unwearied pains of the centenarian bishop Acacius of Beroëa in Syria, been again restored. Among the bishops of Syria, several men were at that time to be found who were distinguished for profound knowledge, genuine and ardent piety, and freedom from that worldly spirit by which so many of their colleagues were governed. By the relations of former friendship they were, for the most part, well disposed to Nestorius, as they were, by their moderate way of thinking, inclined to take the part of mediators of peace between the two parties. In this feeling, the person who in rank stood first among these bishops, John, patriarch of Antioch, wrote to Nestorius, with the common understanding of six other bishops of this district who happened just then to be assembled with him. He transmitted to him the letters which he had received from Alexandria and Rome, accompanied by remarks of his own, distinguished for Christian wisdom and moderation. He begged of him so to read the letters which he sent as not to allow himself to be hurried away by those impulses of passion,

* In this letter he says, for example, with regard to the determinations of the Roman synod: Οἱ ἀνάγκη πείθεσθαι τοὺς ἀντιχρυστινοὺς τῆς πρὸς ἀπάσας τὴν δύσιν κοινωνίας.

† The so called ἀνατολικοί.

out of which the hurtful spirit of dispute and self-will were wont to spring; nor yet to despise this matter, which might lead to an irremediable evil; but with friends of the same mind with himself, to whom he must allow the liberty of impartially telling him the truth, to inquire with calmness what ought to be done. He presented before him the danger of the new rupture which threatened to take place. What insolence would not opponents, who had already arrogated so much to themselves, assume after reading these letters! * He regretted that the whole dispute had arisen about a bare word, which in fact, even according to the opinion of Nestorius himself, might be used in a right sense, and had already been used in this sense by many church-teachers. The Roman bishop had, indeed, allowed him but a short respite of only ten days, but he needed not even so short a space as this for reflection. He could in a few hours decide as to the explanation which should be given, for he needed not hesitate to approve a term whose fundamental sense, according to the right understanding of it, he certainly did not reject. He called upon him to offer this sacrifice for the sake of preserving the peace of the church. What the patriarch John here advised, his friend agreed, in fact, with the sentiments which he himself had already expressed, of his own accord, on a previous occasion; and accordingly Nestorius, in his reply, after having explained the origin of the whole dispute, said that he had nothing to object to the term *Θεότοκος*, provided only it was guarded against misrepresentation, and understood in a right sense as designating the union † of the two natures. But with regard to the habitual arrogance of the Egyptian—he wrote to the patriarch John—there was no reason why he, in particular, should be surprised at it, for he had before him many old examples of the same thing. ‡ Nestorius was then hoping for

* A remarkable expression in the letter of the patriarch: *Ἐνόησαν γὰρ, ὡς εἰ πρὸ τῶν νῦν ἀποσταλέντων γραμμάτων οἱ πολλοὶ ἄσχιτοι ἦσαν καὶ ἡμῶν, νῦν δὲ ἀξιομενοὶ, τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων τούτων παρήσσιας τινος οὐκ ἔσονται, καὶ ποῖα οὐ χρήσονται καὶ ἡμῶν παρήσσια.* Unless we suppose that the patriarch is speaking here simply *per anakoinosin*,—which, however, is not probable,—we find here a hint of the many attacks which the bishops of Eastern Asia had already had to endure.

† Propter unionis rationem.

‡ De consueta v. g. Egyptii præsumptione maxime tua religiositas non debet admirari, dum habes antiqua hujus exempla perplurima. Here,

a general ecclesiastical assembly, at which this controversy could easily be disposed of by a general agreement. He had no presentiment at that time of the preponderance of the opposite party at court.

Had this plan of Nestorius been adopted, the dispute might still have been for the present suppressed, although indeed only for the moment, since the opposition of the two doctrinal tendencies lying at the root of this controversy about the term *θεότοκος* would most assuredly, sooner or later, openly manifest itself.

But, by the arrogant conduct of Cyrill, the dispute about a word with which the Syrian church also was satisfied, was converted into a contest between the doctrinal systems of the two churches. Cyrill determined to act as the executor of the sentence passed by the Roman synod. In this year, 430, he sent a letter, in the name of a synod held at Alexandria, to Nestorius, in which, conformably to the sentence pronounced at Rome, he was for summoning him, the third and last time, to recant. He laid before him the system of doctrines which he must confess as the true system, and unfolded in twelve formulas of condemnation (*ἀναθεματισμοί*) what he had to recant. These explanations, however, contained nothing else than the Egyptian creed carried out in opposition to the rigidly Antiochian system, as it had been expressed by Theodore of Mopsuestia—a *ένωσις φυσική* (natural union) as opposed to the *ένωσις κατ' ἀξίαν, εὐδοκίαν* (union by 'worth, favour)—a *ένωσις*, and not a *συναφεία* (union, and not conjunction)—which last formula expressed too little. One Son of God, one Christ out of two natures; or, as he preferred to say, formed of two different things into an indissoluble unity.* In the one Logos, who had become man, the different divine and human predicates were, indeed, still to be distinguished; but not so the two natures. Both kinds of predicates were to be referred to one and the same Logos, who became man. One Logos with his own proper body.† Hence the unconditional transfer of predicates,—as, for example, that Mary had corporeally borne the Logos from God who became

too, we have a noticeable indication of the contests which had before existed between the Egyptian and Syrian Churches.

* Έκ δύο καὶ διαφόρων πραγμάτων εἰς ἐνοτήτα τὴν ἀφίριστον συνηνεγ. ἕνος.

† Εἰς λόγος μετὰ τῆς ἰδίας σάρκος.

flesh ;* that the Logos from God had suffered and been crucified according to the flesh.† &c.

This step of the bishop Cyrill gave the whole matter a different turn, for it was thereby necessarily converted from a personal attack on Nestorius into an attack on the form of doctrine taught in the Syrico-Asiatic church. So it was considered by the most authoritative teachers of that church. John, patriarch of Antioch, who stood at their head, deemed it necessary to enter into a public refutation of these anathemas, and selected Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, a town on the Euphrates, for this purpose.‡ This man, otherwise distinguished for his Christian moderation and gentleness, allowed himself, however, in this instance, to be misled by his dogmatic zeal, though springing no doubt out of a purely Christian interest, into an unfair judgment. With right he might complain that Cyrill's formulas of condemnation failed in accuracy of doctrinal expression, and that from this defect a dangerous reaction was to be apprehended on Christian knowledge. With good right he supposed that the extravagances of expression, which might perhaps be tolerated in the composition of Christian hymns, and in the more rhetorical language of the homilies, would be followed with dangerous consequences in doctrinal language, and could not be so mildly judged.§ Very justly, he felt himself bound to enter the

* Γεγενήκε σαρκικῶς σάρκα γεγονότα τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ λόγον.

† Τὸν Θεοῦ λόγον πάθοντα σάρκι καὶ ἐσταυρωμένον σάρκι.

‡ Ep. 150, among the letters of Theodoret.

§ In his circulatory letter addressed to the Syrian monks, in opposition to the anathemas of Cyrill, ep. 151, where he speaks of the expression used concerning Mary, εἰ καὶ πανηγυρικῶς τις λέγειν ἐθέλει καὶ ὕμνους ὑφαίνειν καὶ ὑπαίνοους διξίεῖναι καὶ βούλεται τοῖς σημαντοῖσι ὀνόμασιν ἀναγκαιῶς χρῆσθαι, οὐ δογματίζων, ἀλλὰ πανηγυρίζων καὶ θαυμάζων ὡς οἶντε τοῦ μυστηρίου τὸ μεγέθος, ἀπολαύτω τοῦ πόθου καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις ὀνόμασι χρῆσθω. This more closely drawn distinction betwixt liturgical, ascetic and properly dogmatic language, was, as a general thing, characteristic of the Syrian church. Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, traces the whole corruption of dogmatic terminology to the confounding of the two distinct forms of language. Et quidem ut in festivitatibus sive in præconiis atque doctrinis incircumspecte *Dei genetrix* sive *Deum enixa* ad orthodoxis tantummodo sine adjectione diceretur, vel *Deicidæ* *Judæi* (*Ῥεόκτονοι*) vel quia *verbum incarnatum* est cæt., sane nulla accusatione sunt digna, eo quod nec dogmatice sunt posita ista. Epistola Alexandri Hierapolitani ad Theodoretum in Tragedia Irenæi ed. Lupus. Opp. Tom. VII. c. 94, f. 247 ; also in opp. Theodreti, ed. Halens. T. V. ep. 78.

strongest protest against this thing in particular, that Cyrill was bent on making a form of doctrinal expression which was so inexact, and so liable to misconstruction, the prevailing formula in the Oriental church; and for stigmatizing as heresy everything that did not accord with it. But still he ought to have distinguished the doctrine lying at bottom from the form of the expression, and not to have attributed to Cyrill doctrines which he could derive from his assertions only by inferences, against which Cyrill had expressly enough guarded; as he did, in fact, contrive to find, in the condemnatory sentences of Cyrill, Apollinarian, Gnostic, and Manichean errors. Now as Cyrill, in defending his anathemas, proceeded in the same way against Theodoret's system of faith, it was a matter of course that, although the more temperate form of the Syrian creed approximated very nearly to that of Cyrill, yet the opposition between the two systems became more and more apparent, and the difficulty of coming to a calm, mutual understanding with regard to differences, every day increased. A difference between the two systems existed, it is true, all along, and this had its ground in the fact that Theodoret was seeking to unfold the truth under the forms of the understanding; while Cyrill, avoiding everything of that sort, was for holding fast only to the transcendent fact, so that those nicer distinctions of the understanding appeared to him an undervaluing or a denial of the mystery. But, notwithstanding all this, the dispute on many of the formulas was made of so much weight because the parties did not mutually understand each other as to their meaning. Theodoret vehemently controverted the doctrine of a *ἐνωσις φυσική*, of a *ἐνωσις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*, because he maintained that God was thereby subjected to a natural necessity, and the distinction of the conceptions of deity and humanity which had become united in Christ, was impossible; but Cyrill understood those expressions in another sense, and guarded himself sufficiently against all those interpretations. He opposed that *ἐνωσις φυσική* and *καθ' ὑπόστασιν* to a barely moral union, consisting in the will or in the mode of conduct. He accused his opponents of holding to the latter only; but Theodoret in fact taught expressly that deity and humanity were united in one person.*

* *Ἐν πρόσωπον*. He would not say *μία ὑπόστασις*, because he took this term in another sense.

Out of these different doctrinal tendencies, however, arose also a different mode of apprehending several particulars in the life of Christ. Theodoret did not hesitate, in following the gospel history, to ascribe to our Saviour, during his life on earth, in reference to his humanity, a limited knowledge, and to say "that this humanity, in that point of time, knew only so much as the indwelling deity revealed to it."* But to Cyrill this assertion appeared scandalous: he affirmed, on the other hand, that whoever said a revelation, and that a graduated one, was made by the indwelling God to the servant-form, made of Christ a mere prophet. As he was not disposed, however, directly to deny the ignorance predicated of the human nature of Christ, since he recognized the attributes of the latter in their individuality, he expressed himself, with a view to mark strongly the incomprehensibleness of the mystery, after a form to which he could hardly attach any definite meaning: "When Christ subjected himself to the general *mass* of human nature, which is limited in its knowledge, he appropriated *this part of it* also by a special economy,† although still he had no bounds to his knowledge, but was, with the Father, omniscient."‡

Thus, then, this arbitrary, illegal conduct of Cyrill tended at first to injure rather than to benefit his cause. In the consciousness of his right and of his independent dignity, Nestorius received the episcopal deputies who brought to him the requisitions of Cyrill and Cœlestin, with merited contempt: he did not allow himself to be interrupted thereby in the preaching of his doctrine, and he opposed to the anathemas of Cyrill twelve others.

In the emperor's court at Constantinople, also, the conduct of Cyrill created an impression very unfavourable to the latter. The complaints of his arrogance and love of power, which had been already received there before, seemed thereby to be confirmed. All the previous steps of Cyrill in this affair being placed along with the last, seemed to indicate a deeply-laid scheme for the arbitrary supplanting of Nestorius; but men

* Τῆς τοσαύτης κατ' ἐκείνου τοῦ καιροῦ γνωσκούσης, ὅσα ἡ ἐνοικοῦσα θείατης ἀπικάλυψε.

† Οἰκονομικῶς, οἰκιοῦνται καὶ τοῦτο μιστὰ τῶν ἄλλων.

‡ He says also: Αὐτοῦ παντὶς ἵσται καὶ τὸ εἰδέναι καὶ τὸ μὴ εἰδέναι δοκεῖν.

were determined not to tolerate this despotism which individual bishops wished to exercise over the whole church, and not to sacrifice Nestorius to any such arbitrary caprice of an individual. According to that system of church constitution which alone was recognized at Constantinople, Cyrill's arbitrary will could gain no legal authority from the dictatorial conduct of a Roman bishop. Since, then, it had already been determined upon before, to assemble a general council to attend to other ecclesiastical matters, according to the wish of Nestorius himself, and according to the proposal of his opponents, so, by these new events, the prosecution of this purpose was hastened to a completion; for the investigation of the matters in dispute by a general council would be set over against the arbitrary decision of individual bishops and synods. The emperor was resolved to approve nothing but the decision of such a council; but as Constantinople had before (see above) been fixed upon as the place for the meeting of the council, so now the city of Ephesus was appointed instead of it. This change of the place was occasioned, beyond all doubt, by some special cause. Probably fears were entertained of the combination of Cyrill with a certain party of the Byzantine court and with influential monks. So on the 19th of November, 430, the emperor Theodosius II. issued a proclamation to all the metropolitans of his empire, summoning them to meet in a council to be holden at Ephesus, about Pentecost, in the following year. But along with the general proclamation addressed to Cyrill, as it was to all the metropolitan bishops, the emperor sent to the former a special one, in which he severely reprimanded him for his conduct thus far, and declared to him that he would suffer it no longer. This letter is drawn up with more good sense than we should expect from a Theodosius, and we can scarcely be mistaken in supposing that it was dictated by a wiser head.

It called upon Cyrill to recollect that pure doctrine was found by investigation rather than by the assumption of authority; for from the first* it had been established, not by the threat of any potentate whatever, but by the deliberations of the fathers. Let Cyrill declare then (it proceeded) why, neglecting the emperor, of whom he knew that the cause of piety lay near his heart, and neglecting all the priests in all the

* At all events it should have been so.

churches, who ought rather to have been assembled for the purpose of settling the matters in dispute, he has chosen, as much as in him lay, to excite disorders and divisions in the church? And no wonder he had here overstepped the bounds of propriety, as he had not even spared the imperial family itself; for why had he written twice—once to the emperor and to the empress, and a second time to his sister Pulcheria? Doubtless for no other reason than because he either believed that they were at difference with each other, or else hoped to set them at difference by his letter. But were the first the case, it betrayed a censurable curiosity (a prying interference in the concerns of the court) for a bishop who lived so remote from the court, to know anything about such matters; and, if it were not the case, the wish to excite such discord was nowhere less befitting than in a bishop. But it betrayed the same disposition to be stirring up discord in the imperial family and to be exciting it among the churches, as if one had no other means of making one's self famous.

The emperor, at the appointed time, sent to Ephesus the Comes Candidianus, as his plenipotentiary before the synod, with the express command that he should not interfere with the doctrinal proceedings of the council, but only use his authority for the preservation of order.* Doubtless there were reasons for the anxiety which led to such a precautionary measure; and many other things, indeed, contained in the letter which the emperor addressed to the synod, confirm this conjecture. For he directed, at the same time, that all persons belonging to the secular order, and all monks who had assembled at Ephesus, or who should afterwards assemble there, should, without exception, leave the place, in order that the peaceful and calm investigation of doctrine might not be disturbed by them, and that no passionate feelings or discord might be excited. There may, then, have already existed reasons for apprehending—an apprehension which indeed afterwards proved to be but too well founded—that the Cyrillian party would have at their service many instruments quite alien from the spiritual investigation. Furthermore, the bishops were forbidden, during the proceedings, to leave the synod, and especially to visit the court of Constantinople; an order which indicates

* In the Imperial *saera* directed to the synods, Harduin. Concil. T. I. 1346. "Ὅστι τῇ συνόδῳ πανταχόθεν περιφυλαχθῆναι τὸ ἀπάραχον.

again that there were many grounds for fearing the intrigues of the Cyrillian party with the court. It is clear, moreover, from all the facts, how far the emperor then was from tolerating the forcible supplantation of Nestorius. His favourable disposition towards the patriarch was shown by his allowing him alone to take with him, as his companion to Ephesus, a friend of noble rank, the Comes Irenæus.

Cyrill and Nestorius arrived at Ephesus at the appointed time. Cyrill brought with him a great number of Egyptian bishops, whose interests were identical with his own, and who were his devoted tools. The bishop Memnon of Ephesus was his friend, and, perhaps, as the opponent of the Constantinopolitan patriarch, whose ecclesiastical supremacy these consequential metropolitans reluctantly acknowledged, bound to Cyrill by a common interest. This alliance secured to him a dominant influence over the bishops of Asia Minor; and as Memnon, being of like disposition with Cyrill, doubtless exercised a like authority at Ephesus to that which the latter exercised at Alexandria, it moreover gave him a great power in the city where the council was assembled. It was probably on account of his fear of this power that Nestorius requested and obtained of the imperial commissioner a guard, who surrounded his dwelling, and allowed no one to enter without being announced. This, it is true, may be reckoned along with the many other adventitious circumstances of state which surrounded the great bishops of the Roman empire, as indeed his opponents taunted him on this military attendance; but a bishop of the party hostilely disposed to him, Acacius of Melitene, hints perhaps at the true motive when he says * that Nestorius was induced to this step *by fear*. It is true he explains the fact according to his own views, attributing this fear to the bad conscience with which the heretic must have been troubled. But when we consider what a fanatical spirit had been breathed into the Cyrillian party,—what an influence this spirit might exert on the rude popular masses which were devoted to this party, especially if the charges laid against Cyrill in several public declarations—and which appear by no means so improbable, to judge from the dominion which he exercised at Alexandria—if these charges are true, namely, that he engaged the peasants of Asia Minor and the Egyptian

* Concil. Ephes. act. 1, T. I. f. 1390.

sailors to execute his tyrannical behests,*—we may easily find another cause for the apprehensions of Nestorius. The party of Cyrill affirmed, it is true, in their report to the emperor, that no disturbances had taken place at Ephesus which could have given Nestorius any occasion for such precaution;† but the proverb might here be applied, that he who excuses himself is his own accuser.

After the bishops, assembled at Ephesus, had already waited several weeks beyond the term fixed upon by the emperor, there were many who should have assisted at the synod that were still detained by various circumstances from being present. The absence of the deputies from the Roman bishop, who had been detained by unfavourable winds, would give Cyrill neither concern nor satisfaction; for he could reckon upon their approbation of whatever he and his party might carry through at the council, whether they were present at the proceedings or not. But he must have rejoiced to find it in his power to open the council without the assistance of the patriarch John of Antioch, and the other Syrian bishops; for it was from these alone, who were for the most part friendly to Nestorius, or, at least, all of them thoroughly opposed to the Egyptian doctrines, and altogether independent of the Egyptian influence, that he had to expect the most decided opposition. The patriarch John had, in the first place, been obliged to put off his journey on account of a famine which was then prevailing at Antioch, beyond what was usual in that populous capital of Roman Asia in the East, and on account of the popular tumults which had thence arisen.‡ Besides, the violent rains in many of the districts through which the long land-route from Antioch to Ephesus led had occasioned inundations, by which the journey was rendered more difficult and slow. Sixteen days had already elapsed beyond the term appointed by the emperor for the opening of the synod. The Syrian bishops, after having

* In the letter of the patriarch John of Antioch, and the bishops connected with him: Harduin. l. c. 1459. *Ναυταῖς τὴν Αἰγυπτίον καὶ ἀγροῖ-
καις Ἀσιάνοις ὑποῦργοις τῆς τυραννίδος χρησαμένοι, l. c. 1454. Πλήθος τὸ
ἀγροίκικον συναγάγων διαταράζει τὴν πόλιν.* Nestorius says, in his report to
the emperor, that Cyrill placed soldiers, probably procured through the
influence of Memnon of Ephesus, around the market-place, and set the
whole city in an uproar. L. c. 1438. † L. c. 1442.

‡ The letter of John to the emperor. Harduin. l. 1459.

been thirty days on the road, were still from five to six days' journey from Ephesus. The patriarch John informed Cyrill of this in a respectful letter, which he sent to excuse their delay.* After having delayed for *so long* a time the opening of the council, the deputies certainly might have waited for these few days longer. But though forty-one bishops insisted that the arrival of their colleagues, who were now distant but a few days' journey, ought to be waited for; and though they declared that they were resolved not to take part in any earlier assembling of the council; though Nestorius would receive no message from a party assembly; though the imperial commissioner issued several protests against the regularity of such an assembly, which was counter to the emperor's summons; yet Cyrill, having secured the support of Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, and Juvenalis, bishop of Jerusalem, and relying upon the vast number of Egyptian bishops and bishops of Asia Minor, was not to be deterred by any of these things; and on the 22nd of June, A.D. 431, he opened the synod with about two hundred bishops. He endeavoured afterwards, it is true, to justify this proceeding, on the pretence that the patriarch John had purposely delayed; that he was unwilling to take any part in the sentence of deposition to be pronounced on Nestorius, which he doubtless foresaw would be the result of the synod, and of which affair he was heartily ashamed; while many of the bishops coming from Eastern Asia had mentioned, in the commission of their patriarch, that the council might do what they pleased, without waiting for their arrival.† But the above-mentioned letter of the patriarch John seems more deserving of credit than this assertion of Cyrill, as the latter would naturally seek after everything in the shape of an excuse for a mode of procedure so manifestly illegal; and it is moreover difficult to conceive that the patriarch John, who then assuredly entertained the purpose of sustaining his friend Nestorius, would have designedly sacrificed him to the Cyrillian party, whom he then had no occasion whatever to fear.

This assembly was partly a blind instrument in the hands of Cyrill, who by various artifices had contrived to gain the

* Concil. Ephes. Pars I. c. 21. Harduin. I. 1348.

† Cyrill, in his letter to the clergy of Constantinople. I. Harduin. f. 1435.

entire influence over it,* and partly it was governed by the wildest fanaticism. Of course a regular and orderly investigation was not to be thought of; the result to be arrived at had already been settled and determined; and hence all the proceedings which were to lead to it, could easily be despatched in a single day. Cyrill, as the champion of the pure doctrine, was loaded with flattering encomiums; his letters to Nestorius, which were read, and his anathemas, were applauded as expressing the pure doctrine. Nestorius having declined two invitations of the council to be present at their deliberations, and having declared that he should appear only when all the bishops were assembled, a third summons, in the customary form, which was usually observed even when men were acting in the very face of the laws, was now sent him by four bishops, accompanied by a notary and a church prelector.† Nestorius, who, according to the original purpose of the assembly, was to appear as an assistant in the investigations, not as a defendant on trial, was called upon by the most holy synod, as they styled themselves, to vindicate himself; and was threatened, in case he did not appear and answer to the written and oral charges laid against him, that the synod would find it necessary to proceed against him according to the ecclesiastical rules.‡ The guard, who were stationed in the front court of the house, refused, according to their orders, to admit the bishops to Nestorius, and moreover informed them that, if they waited till night, they would receive no other answer from Nestorius than the one already given.‡

Although Nestorius had every lawful reason to protest against this tribunal, yet the council proceeded to consider itself as the regular body to judge and decide upon his case; and his refusal to appear before them was construed as an

* Cyrill is said to have made use, in this case also, of bribery, a favourite means of his for accomplishing his ends. This is intimated by the bishop Ibas of Edessa, in his letter to the Persian church-teacher, Mares: Προλάβων ὁ Κυρίλλος τὰς ἀκοὰς τῷ φαρμάκῳ τῷ περιῶντι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῶν σόφων προκατέσχευεν. S. Concil. Chalc. act. 10. Harduin. II. f. 530. Ibas was one of the Orientals who came to Ephesus in company with the patriarch John. In the above letter, he shows, indeed, that he belonged to a party, but still manifests no excitement

† For the purpose of reading before Nestorius the letter of the synod, and taking a note of his answer.

‡ S. Harduin. Concil. T. I. f. 1362.

admission on his own part of his guilt. His letters to Cyrill were read, and received with marks of disapprobation as universal as the applauses bestowed on the letters of Cyrill. One proof of the unchristian, fanatical passion which animated this synod was given in the following sally of the bishop Euoptios of Ptolemais* at the reading of these letters:—"As those," said he, "who counterfeit the imperial coin, deserve the extremest punishment, so Nestorius, who has presumed to falsify the doctrines of orthodoxy, deserves every punishment both from God and man."† Even familiar remarks of Nestorius and his friends, dropped in their conversations with other bishops during their residence at Ephesus, were brought up against him and perverted. In the vehemence into which a man of his temperament might easily be hurried in dispute, he had remarked, when reprobating the crass-sounding expressions of the other party, that it surely could not be affirmed God had been two or three months old. This was so construed as if he meant to deny the deity of Christ. One of Nestorius' friends had said that the Jews could bring suffering on the man indeed, but not on the deity itself. This was regarded as an unheard-of blasphemy, as an attempt to justify the Jews, and to extenuate their sin.‡ The synod, accordingly, as they declared with pharisaical hypocrisy, *after many tears*, constrained by the laws of the church, and by the letter of the Roman bishop Cœlestin, pronounced the sentence, which they dared to express in the following form:—"Our Lord Jesus Christ, by Nestorius blasphemed, has ordained, by this most holy synod, that the Nestorius above named should be excluded from the episcopal dignity and from the whole college of priests."§ After the synod had passed this sentence, the bishop Rheginus of Constantia, on the island of Cyprus, preached a discourse, which, short as it is, presents a most singular exhibition of extravagant dogmatic formulas, repugnant to all human and Christian feelings, and even savouring of idolatry, by which it was imagined to do honour to the living Christ; a picture of fanaticism sacrificing as well the spirit of Christ, as that of reason. On the ground

* Who must have been a very different man from his brother and predecessor, the gentle and free-minded Synesius.

† L. c. 1391. ‡ Harduin. f. 1398 and 1399. § L. c. f. 1422.

of this dispute about pitiable forms of conception, pitiable in the comparison with Christianity, which is *spirit and life*, and the essence of which is *love*, the victim now branded as a heretic was pronounced worse than Cain, and the Sodomites. The earth ought, of good rights, to open and swallow him up; fire ought to rain down on him from heaven that the simple might see his transgression punished! The God Logos, whom he had ventured to sever, who had come forth in the flesh from Mary the mother of God, would appoint for him the punishment of eternal torments in the day of judgment. The bishop concluded his discourse with an invitation opposed to the Antiochian creed, and consonant with the whole tenour of his remarks, as follows:—"But let us worship and adore the God Logos, who has condescended to walk among us in the flesh, without separating himself from the essence of the Father!"*—As if this worship of the incarnate God did not exist among the party of Nestorius, because they expressed themselves, respecting the appearance of the same incarnate God, in other dogmatic forms! Thus a new slavery to forms of expression in religion was again to be substituted in the place of the worship of God in spirit and in truth!

Cyrill caused the above sentence of deposition pronounced upon Nestorius to be publicly affixed at Ephesus, and indeed to be proclaimed by heralds through the whole city.† The bishops who had constituted that assembly, or who formed the Cyrillian party, moreover, despatched a letter worthy of the spirit of this party to the emperor, in which they informed him of the sentence passed by the synod, which they affirmed themselves to be. They offered various excuses, the emptiness of which could easily be exposed, for opening the proceedings before the arrival of the patriarch John and his associates. They resorted to the most abominable perversions of those familiar remarks of Nestorius already mentioned, in order to present him in the light of a blasphemer of the holiest things. They affirmed he had not ceased to maintain that He who had for our sakes become man, ought not to be called God; that he made the human nature which the deity had assumed from love to man an objection to that deity; that he ridiculed the

* L. c. 1444.

† According to the declaration of the Comes Candidianus. Harduin. l. c. 1451.

mystery of the divine incarnation. They prayed the emperor to command that the entire doctrine of Nestorius should be expunged from the churches, and that his books, by which he sought to deny the grace of God, should be committed to the flames wherever they might be found.

Nestorius, and ten bishops united with him, thereupon sent another letter to the emperor, in which they described, according to the truth, the arbitrary and illegal proceedings of Cyrill and Memnon. They submitted to the emperor the just petition that he would either secure for them a residence at Ephesus safe from injury, and order the constitution of a regular assembly, so that none of the clergy or monks, whether belonging to themselves or to the Egyptians, and none of the bishops who had not been called, might be present to disturb the synod (only two bishops from each metropolitan diocese, men competent to enter into such investigations, were to attend the assembly with their metropolitans);* or that the emperor would enable them to return back free from peril to their churches. This demand clearly places the party of Nestorius in an advantageous light. It is evident that they wished to obtain the victory, not by superiority of numbers, not by violence and clamour, but by calm and rational investigation; whereas, on the other hand, a suspicion of the opposite kind is thereby cast on the party of Cyrill.†

The imperial commissioner was of the same mind with Nestorius; as indeed he had at the very outset declared the assembly of Cyrill's party to be illegal, and contrary to the emperor's letters warrant. He therefore insisted that their decrees could have no legal validity; and in conformity with these views, he drew up also on his part a report to the emperor, and advised those bishops who had not been present at the Cyrillian assemblies, not to allow themselves to be forced to subscribe the decrees of that body, but to wait till the arrival of the Syrian patriarch. Candidian, on account of his intimate connection with the Syrian church party, might be accused of a partiality unbefitting his position; but it appears evident that he did not espouse the party of any doctrinal system; but, conformably to his office, took part, of course, with those who most rigidly observed the forms of law. Where the matter related to a conflict between arbitrary will

* Harduin. l. c. 1442.

† L. c. 1439.

and legal order, it was the duty of his office not to remain neutral.

But his neutrality alone would appear a crime in the eyes of the ambitious or fanatical bishops of the Cyrillian party. Still less could they pardon it in him, that he should adopt in earnest the cause of right, and send to Constantinople a report of their tyranny which was according to the truth. Since then these people looked upon everything with the eye of passion, and indulged themselves in the most abominable perversions of words and actions, in every sort of exaggeration, and even falsehood; we can give no confidence to what they report concerning the violent conduct of the man whom credible testimony represents to us as acting uniformly on the side of order, and within the bounds of his commission.*

The bishop John, of Antioch, arrived at Ephesus with his companions, as he had promised, a few days after the organization of the assembly which had been formed by Cryill. Although it may have been true, as was reported by Memnon bishop of Ephesus, that the Cyrillian council had sent deputies to meet him, to bid him welcome, and to inform him of what had been done, yet these assuredly did not conduct themselves in any way suited to make a favourable impression on him; and an arbitrary act like that which had just been consummated, admitted, in truth, of no palliation. John could not be otherwise than highly offended at it; and he was compelled, by the laws of the church, and by the doctrinal principles which he advocated, to consider the proceedings of that council as without force, and to declare them so. It is true that he did not conduct himself, in this case, in the true spirit of prudence and moderation. He, with his bishops—of whom there were but thirty—and a few more, proceeded to form a new council, which considered itself to be the only regular one. The Cyrillian party found something particularly exceptionable and contrary to order in the fact, that so inconsiderable a minority should set themselves up as judges over so overwhelming a majority; but the patriarch John maintained that that majority could have no weight, since it was composed, for the most part, of bishops from Egypt and from Asia Minor,

* As is evident, particularly from what the bishop Memnon of Ephesus reports, in his manifestly lying letter to the clergy at Constantinople. Harduin. Concil. l. c. f. 1595.

wholly dependent on Cyrill and Memnon. Candidian considered it his duty to present himself also before this party convention, as he had done before the previous one. He here made report of the conduct he had there observed; he read before them the imperial ordinance, which was addressed to the whole council, and then immediately withdrew. The council now passed sentence of deposition upon Cyrill and Memnon, and excommunicated the other members who took any part in the proceedings of that party assembly, until they should manifest penitence and condemn the anathemas of Cyrill. This sentence pronounced upon the two bishops they made known by posting it up publicly; and they drew up a report of it, which was sent to the emperor. In accordance therewith, they called upon the other bishops to separate themselves from Cyrill and Memnon, and to unite with them in forming a general council according to the imperial letters patent.

But Cyrill governed the collective body of the bishops with whom he had held the first council. Meantime the deputies of the Roman bishop arrived, who had received instructions to proceed in all respects according to the advice and will of Cyrill, yet at the same time to insist on the supreme judicial authority of the Roman Church. If the synod fell into disputes, they should be mindful that it did not become them to take any share as a party in the controversy, but to pass judgment on the opinions expressed by the others.* These deputies, therefore, stuck closely throughout to the council of Cyrill; they requested the earlier proceedings to be read to them at one of its sessions, and signified their approbation of the whole. So this council now considered itself warranted to claim for itself the authority of the Roman bishop. On the presentation of a complaint to this party-council by Cyrill and Memnon, the patriarch John was, in the customary form, thrice summoned to appear before it, and defend his conduct; the penalties of the church being threatened in case of dis-

* The words of the *commonitorium*, which Cœlestin gave to his legates, were as follows: Ad fratrem et cœpiscopum nostrum Cyrillum consilium vestrum omne convertite et quicquid in ejus videritis arbitrio, facietis. Et auctoritatem sedis apostolicæ custodiri debere mandamus. Ad discepcionem si fuerit ventum, vos de eorum sententiis judicare debetis, non subire certamen. Harduin, l. c. f. 1347.

obedience. But as John declined entering into any negotiations with this council,—which he did not recognize as a regular one, but declared that, after he had made out his report in full to Constantinople, he should merely wait until he could receive from there leave to return home,—the council passed sentence on him and his associates, that they should in the first place be suspended from their episcopal and priestly functions, reserving the whole severity of the ecclesiastical laws to be employed against them, in case they did not alter their conduct.

Meanwhile the report of Candidian was producing the effect at Constantinople, which, if the fanaticism and intrigue of a court party had not stood in the way, must necessarily have resulted from it. On the 29th of June, the emperor sent a letter to the synod, drawn up with impartiality and moderation, of which an imperial officer, the magistrianus Palladius, was made the bearer. The emperor censured in it the illegal conduct of the bishops, which had manifestly proceeded from passion, yet without designating any persons by name against whom this censure was particularly directed. He declared that he would approve only of the result of a deliberation on the disputed doctrine, instituted by the whole council in common. Another imperial commissioner of rank was to observe the course of proceedings in company with Candidian, and prevent any further steps contrary to law. Until then, no one of the bishops could be permitted to return home to his diocese, or to *visit the court*.* The emperor avowed that it was not so much the person of Nestorius or of any other individual, as the cause of truth, which lay near his heart.† The imperial messenger above mentioned must doubtless have been charged by the emperor—so important seemed to him this occasion—to hasten in every way his journey to Ephesus and his return to Constantinople; for the answer of the Cyrillian synod which he brought back was dated the first of July. These bishops defended themselves therein against the reproach of passionate conduct; they persisted in maintaining that Nestorius had been rightfully deposed on account of his erroneous doctrines; and they accused the count Candidian of

* It is easy to see that there were reasons for apprehending the last, particularly from the members of the Cyrillian party.

† L. c. Harduin, f. 1539.

having, out of partiality to Nestorius, given a false representation of the whole matter. A letter of this sort, however, would produce but little effect. Candidian's report to the emperor, which bore on its very face the impress of truth, furnished a ready key to explain the whole state of the case. Besides, the count Irenæus, who accompanied Nestorius to Ephesus, and had shown himself there to be a true friend, and many other persons of consideration at Constantinople, who were also his friends, warmly supported his cause. Cyrill was therefore obliged to resort to other means to turn the balance in his favour. He could reckon upon the ignorant, fanatical zealots among the monks of that city. Among these was an Archimandrite, by the name of Dalmatius, who stood in the highest consideration. For eight and forty years he had never left the cell in which he had immured himself! The emperor himself had occasionally visited him there to ask for his intercessions; but he had sometimes besought him in vain—on the occurrence of earthquakes, which frequently filled Constantinople with alarm—to leave his solitude, and take part in the public penitential processions.* We may presume that the new patriarch from the Antiochian school had already from the first been represented to this monk, by Alexandrian influence, as a dangerous teacher of error; for, after the arrival of Nestorius, he was wont to say to those who visited him in his cell: "Take heed to yourselves, my brethren; for an evil beast has come into this city, and he may injure many by his doctrines."† This person, then, Cyrill contrived to rouse to action in favour of his own party and aims, by giving him an account of the sentence of deposition passed upon Nestorius, and of the sufferings of the defenders of the true faith

* Garduin. l. c. f. 1587.

† L. c. 1447. This Dalmatius was a writer at one of the imperial bureaus, σχολάριος ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ σχολῇ, and had a wife and children,—when, through the influence of a venerated monk, Isacios, he was induced to become a monk. He obtained great influence, was frequently called upon to settle quarrels among citizens, as is told in the Greek history of his life, published by Banduri, in the second volume of his *imperium orientale*. When the new patriarchs entered upon their office, it was the custom for them first to visit and pay their respects to Dalmatius in his cell; but Nestorius, according to this account, had not been admitted to him. It is easy to see what advantage Cyrill might gain by securing such an instrument.

on that account. This story Dalmatius received through a letter addressed to the bishops and monks residing at Constantinople, which a beggar brought to that city, concealed in a hollow reed ;—whether the truth was that Cyrill, as he pretended, was obliged to resort to this shift, in order to have the letter safely reach its destination, because the men who sought to frustrate Cyrill's plots took pains to intercept his communications to the clergy and monks at Constantinople ; or whether it was that the necessity of employing such means was a mere pretence, contrived for the purpose of heating the minds of his partisans by such evidence of the oppression to which he was subjected. Might we suppose that the bearer of the letter was no beggar, but a bishop in the disguise of one, we should then see another motive for resorting to this species of secret communication ;—the bearer who was to visit Constantinople unperceived, under this disguise, would doubtless be entrusted with the execution of other oral commissions.*

This message, then, set the whole party of zealous monks in commotion. Dalmatius imagined himself summoned by a voice from heaven to come forth from his solitude of eight and forty years, in order to save the churches from the great threatening danger. All the monks and abbots forsook their cloisters, and chanting psalms with alternate choirs, marched in procession with burning torches, Dalmatius at their head, to the palace of the emperor. A procession of this sort could not fail to set the people all in a ferment, and to spread the alarm far and wide that the true faith was in imminent jeopardy ; and hence vast multitudes of the people joined the procession. The abbots were summoned to an audience in the palace, while the crowds of monks and of the people remained standing before it, chanting in their choirs. Dalmatius addressed the emperor before a crowded court in the same bold and confident tone in which he was wont to converse with him. He handed over to him the letter of the synod, and the weak emperor said, if the case stood thus, the bishops might have leave to come from Ephesus.† But Dal-

* The question arises, how much truth lay at the bottom of this story ;—whether it was only a contrivance to inflame the zeal of Dalmatius, or whether it was the fact that several bishops who had come to Constantinople for the purpose of exciting disturbances had been justly arrested.

† L. c. f. 1587.

matius complained, that of the other party, as many as pleased were permitted to come to Constantinople; on the other hand, whoever of the Cyrillian synod wished to come were detained in custody. He asked the emperor, in his usual style, to whom he would give ear—the six thousand bishops or *one* godless man, and got him to promise that the Cyrillian party should be permitted to send deputies to Constantinople. When Dalmatius announced to the assembled crowd that a favourable answer had been received from the emperor, the whole procession, singing songs of praise from the 150th Psalm, moved forward to a church, where Dalmatius was to read the letter of the synod, and give an account of his audience. After the letter had been read, the assembled people shouted with one voice, “Anathema to Nestorius.” Also the address of Dalmatius to them was followed by an equally loud anathema.

Upon this the Cyrillian party sent three bishops to Constantinople, and it soon became evident what an ascending influence the artifices of these men had succeeded in acquiring. Some who had been till now the favourers of Nestorius, among the rest the imperial chamberlain Scholasticus, were so wrought upon as to join the party against him, it being represented, by the wilful perversion of some of his familiar remarks in conversation, that he was no longer willing to tolerate the application of the term *θεότοκος* to Mary. Nestorius deemed it necessary, therefore, to clear himself from these aspersions. He assured Scholasticus that his views on that point continued to be precisely the same as those he had constantly professed at Constantinople; that he considered the union of the two designations of Mary, *θεότοκος* and *άνθρωπότοκος*, in their different references, to be the mark and badge of perfect orthodoxy. He commended in him his solicitude for the maintenance of the true faith. Were this, he added, but secured, he would joyfully resign the episcopal dignity. In any such case his friend might regard the present letter as one in which he took leave of him; for glad would he be to return back to his old cloister-life, since he knew of nothing higher or more blessed than such tranquillity. And well might it be that Nestorius, after so much sorrowful experience of a turbulent, distracted, and care-worn life, sincerely longed after his former silent and tranquil retirement.

The Asiatic bishops, who were still assembled at Ephesus,

had meanwhile, with a view to counteract the influence of the Cyrillian party, prevailed on the Comes Irenæus, the old friend of Nestorius, to repair to Constantinople with a letter with which they furnished him. He arrived there three days after the arrival of the Cyrillian bishops, and must soon perceive that the latter had been well received by the nobles and higher officers of state, and had been successful in their efforts to weaken the effect of Candidian's report. He laboured earnestly to counteract their influence at court; he prevailed upon the emperor, with his chief ministers of state, to grant a common audience to him and the Egyptian deputies, and listen to the representations of both parties. He succeeded in convincing the emperor, as he writes in the journal of his commission, that the party of Cyrill had proceeded in a way directly contrary to law, so that the emperor was already on the very point of confirming the judgment of the second assembly held under the auspices of the patriarch John, and of threatening additional punishments to the bishops deposed by that body. But the feeble sovereign was the mere tool of court-parties, who were themselves in turn exposed to manifold influences from without. Soon after, the physician John, secretary* of the patriarch Cyrill, came on a visit to Constantinople, and this person soon found means of giving the whole business an entirely different turn. Now the different opinions prevailing at court became manifest. Some, whose hearts were solely bent on the restoration of quiet, desired, in order that this might be obtained in the simplest way, that no inquiry should be made as to the right or wrong of either party; but that, to satisfy all parties, all three of the bishops should be deposed. Others proposed that the sentences of both sides should be annulled, and that deputies should be sent for from Ephesus for the purpose of discovering through them the real course which matters had taken, and of learning to which side the charge of illegal conduct ought to be laid. Many who favoured Cyrill's party endeavoured to procure, that they themselves might be sent to Ephesus, with full powers to inquire into the whole matter on the spot.†

* Συγγραφέας. Without doubt an ecclesiastic, as in this period physicians are not rarely to be met with among the clergy.

† The letter of Irenæus. L. c. 1548.

The party of Cyrill, however, could not as yet obtain the victory: the influence of the moderate class at court was still, as it would seem, too powerful for them. For the present, the plan first mentioned was adopted; and an individual who would have been by no means the choice of the Cyrillian party, since he had no disposition to serve as the tool of a church or theological sect, John, the ministerial secretary of state (*comes sacrarum*), was sent to Ephesus. He arrived in that city with an imperial letter of commission (*sacra*), in which it was commanded that all the three bishops deposed by the synods should remain deposed; and in which the members of the council were exhorted to lay by their mutual strifes, that they might be prepared to return in peace and concord to their several dioceses.

The count John faithfully maintained the position which he was bound to maintain as a minister of the state, acting on the same principles as Candidian had done,—without whose concurrence, moreover, he took no step whatever. He first invited all the bishops to a meeting in his own apartments, where he wished to read over to them the imperial commission; but here he became witness of a most vehement contest between the two parties.* When the greatest part of the day had already been spent in these disputes, he unceremoniously interfered with the authority of force. Nestorius and Cyrill he removed at once. To the rest he read the imperial letter; and for the purpose of carrying it into effect, and preventing disturbances, he committed the three deposed bishops to a respectable and safe custody. After this he laboured in every way to restore peace between the two parties. John of Antioch and his associates manifested at once a ready and willing disposition for this. They were prepared to submit to the emperor's decision, which approved the decrees of both the synods; and they were inclined to come to an agreement with the other party, provided the latter would but agree to condemn the anathemas of Cyrill. But the party of Cyrill was by no means so compliant; the person of their leader was to them of much more importance than the person of Nestorius to their opponents. They would listen to no terms of agreement, unless the other party retracted every thing, manifested

* He says himself, in his letter to the emperor: *Magna facta est seditio, immo prælium et pugna.*

their repentance to the synod, which they considered themselves alone to be, and condemned, in writing, Nestorius and his doctrines. These things the other party of course could not consent to do. As the count was extremely anxious, to convey the news to Constantinople, that he had succeeded in getting the victory over the passions of the bishops, and of uniting them on terms of peace, he sought now to enter at least into negociations for the drawing up of a common confession of faith; but neither would the Egyptian party be persuaded to engage in anything of this kind.* The Orientals had been accused, in the rumours industriously circulated against them by their opponents at Constantinople, of wishing to deprive Mary of the honour of being called Θεότοκος. The emperor had expressly charged the count John to get them to declare themselves on this point. Thus they were led to draw up a confession of faith, in which, after distinguishing with precision the two natures in Christ, they declared that, as confession was made of one Son of God, one Lord, and one Christ, in the sense of a union without confusion of the two natures; so too, in the same sense,† Mary was called the mother of God, because Christ, from the time of the conception, united with himself the temple he had assumed.‡ This confession of faith was laid before the emperor in a letter which the patriarch John wrote him in the name of the synod.

* See their own declaration, l. c. 1594.

† Secundum hunc inconfusæ unionis intellectum. See epistola Johannis, in the Synodicon published by Lupus, (see above,) c. 17; Lupus opera, T. VII. f. 56.

‡ There may, indeed, have been some grounds for the assertion of the Cyrillian synod, in their report to their partizans at Constantinople, that, in drawing up this confession of faith, there was schism among the Orientals themselves, as all were not satisfied with this retention of the word Θεότοκος. That this was a correct assertion is evident from a letter addressed to Theodoret by Alexander bishop of Hierapolis, who was present at Ephesus during these proceedings, in Lupus, l. c. 94. Also to be found in operib. Theodreti ed. Halens. IV. p. 745. This zealous advocate of the Syrian church doctrines sees in the compliant disposition which was then so generally manifested, the incipient intrigues of a party who were ready to give up the truth; and he reminds his friend Theodoret how strenuously he then resisted these measures. Memor est sanctitas tua, quod nec ullo pertulerim eis communicare consilio, de epistola, quæ apud Ephesum facta est . . . vox hæc (theotocos) ad proditionem et calumniam illius, qui rectam fidem docebat (*Nestorii*) inserta est.

But as the count John now saw that all his pains to effect the restoration of peace were defeated by the pride and passion of the Cyrillian party; as he was accused by them of party proceedings, and of despatching false reports to Constantinople; he finally called upon the emperor himself to send for deputies from both parties, and enter personally into an investigation of the whole matter.

This proposal was adopted, and eight bishops from each of the two parties were summoned as deputies to Constantinople. Soon after their departure from Ephesus, Nestorius received there a letter from the pretorian prefect, by which he was informed, in answer to his own previous letter (see above), that the emperor had given all the orders necessary for his returning back, in the most convenient and desirable manner, to his cloister. In this letter there appears no trace of an unfriendly feeling towards Nestorius. The prefect concluded by saying, that with his wisdom, and treasure of inward goods, he stood in no need of condolence; but it is plainly to be seen, that it was believed impossible to retain him any longer in the patriarchate in opposition to the hatred and the power of that party, which, by Cyrill's intrigues at Court, had been formed against Nestorius among the nobles and among the monks at Constantinople.* Nestorius, weary of these harassing cares, gladly availed himself of the conceded permission, and, in his answer to the prefect, only commended to him the care of maintaining pure doctrine. But the contest, which was no longer connected barely with the person of Nestorius, could not be hushed by his removal; on the contrary, the rupture became now more decidedly expressed, when, on the removal of Nestorius, Memnon and Cyrill were again restored to their offices.

It soon became manifest, that the feeble emperor meant to act impartially, but was ever hurried along from one step to another by the Cyrillian party, which exerted its influence through the monks, the clergy, and the courtiers. When the deputies of the two parties arrived at Chalcedon, they were

* The well-informed bishop, Ibas of Edessa, writes on this subject in his letter to Maris: *Νεστόριος δὲ ἐπειδὴ ἐμισεῖτο παρὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν μεγάλων τῶν ὄντων ἐν αὐτῇ, ἐκεί ὑποστρέψαι οὐκ ἠδυνήθη.* It is certain, however, that Nestorius still had a large party in his favour in the church, as appears from the later events.

directed to remain there, and not to come to Constantinople, because apprehensions were entertained of a movement among the monks. At a later period, however, the deputies of the other party obtained leave to visit Constantinople; while, on the other hand, this liberty was withheld from the Oriental delegates. The bishop of Chalcedon stood in alliance with the Cyrillian party; and to its deputies he gave up all the churches which they desired for the purpose of holding worship in them. But the Orientals were excluded from the churches; yet they managed to procure a suitable room, where Theodoret preached before a large audience.* The favourable reception they met with from the people excited to a still higher degree the jealousy of the ferocious monks, by whom the Orientals and their attendants were attacked with stones, several of them not escaping without wounds.† The emperor, at an audience which he gave them at the villa of Rufianus, reproached them with having excited these disturbances by their church assemblies. They now petitioned the emperor to allow them the same justice which the count John had shown at Ephesus, and to forbid the bishops of both parties from holding divine worship until they could come to some mutual agreement. To this the weak emperor replied: "I cannot command *the bishops*." "Well, then," rejoined the bishops, "pray do not command us."

They found, as they declared in their letter written from Chalcedon, the higher magistrates all committed in favour of the creed of Cyrill, having been corrupted either by his gold or by his flatteries. Pulcheria also may have succeeded by this time in rendering her brother thoroughly hostile to the man towards whom he had before been so favourably disposed; so that, when the subject of his restoration was pressed at the emperor's privy council, the very suggestion of such a measure appeared like high treason.‡ The emperor himself said: "Let no one speak to me *of him*: I have had enough of him already."§

* See the letter of Theodoret to Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, Theodoret, l. c. IV. 1568.

† In the second report to the emperor, they name as their assailants, *servos monachorum habitu indutos*; i. e., perhaps not slaves disguised as monks, but such as had once been slaves, but had become monks.

‡ *Defectionis notabamur*.

§ *De hoc mihi nullus loquatur, specimen enim semel dedit*. L. c. 1568.

But the Oriental synod at Ephesus had the courage to write to the emperor, that, although Nestorius might a thousand times flee from the turmoils of strife, and prefer the life of a private man; yet, in order that the faith might receive no detriment, it was no whit the less necessary that the illegal sentence of deposition passed upon him by the party who would introduce Cyrill's heretical anathemas, should be annulled. As the Oriental deputies, after five pretended audiences, saw doubtless that their longer residence, near the court would be to no purpose, they petitioned the emperor, that at least, if an impartial investigation was not to be had, they might themselves be suffered to depart from Chalcedon, and the other bishops from Ephesus. This the emperor granted, but by a decision which, to the Orientals, could not appear otherwise than as an act of unjust and arbitrary will. The sentence of deposition pronounced on Nestorius was suffered to remain valid; but Cyrill—who in the mean time had been allowed to visit Constantinople, where his influence was unbounded—and Memnon, were permitted to return to their dioceses. "Thus the Egyptian," said the Orientals, writing from Chalcedon, "will have it in his power to corrupt every one with his gifts, so as to return, after having done numberless wrongs, to his episcopal seat, while that innocent man can scarcely make good his escape to his cloister." Yet the hatred to Nestorius, and the power of Cyrill's party, to which the emperor himself succumbed, seems to have had far more influence upon him than any preference for the Egyptian system of doctrines. It continued still to be his wish that the two parties might be brought to an agreement on the disputed points of doctrine, and that in this way peace might once more be restored to the church. In announcing to the Cyrillian party at Ephesus that they were discharged from the council, he gave them to understand that, if peace had not been restored, it was no fault of his; but God would know who were to blame. He would never be induced to condemn the Orientals, for they had been convicted in his hearing of no guilt; as none had been willing to enter with them into any theological investigation,—a reproach which must have been meant for the Cyrillian party, who had avoided all discussion with the others.

The negotiations set on foot by the tribune and notary Aristolaos, one of the great officers of state, seemed at first to be

beset with many difficulties, as the demands of the two parties were so directly opposed to each other. The Orientals required from Cyrill a condemnation of his anathemas, but Cyrill refused to give them up. On the other hand, he persisted in requiring that the Orientals should approve the condemnatory sentence pronounced on the person and on the doctrines of Nestorius, and should consent to the ordination of the new patriarch at Constantinople.

But much as Nestorius was disliked at the imperial court, and firmly as all were resolved that he should not again be allowed to be patriarch, yet there was little disposition to support Cyrill in his quarrel with the Syrian doctrines. On the contrary, the dogmatic stiffness of Cyrill was regarded as the cause of the continued divisions in the church, and men were well inclined to demand that he should sacrifice his anathemas in order to preserve the peace of the church. Cyrill was obliged to resort to many of his wonted arts, to summon to his aid all the influence of Pulcheria, of the chamberlains, and court ladies in his alliance, as well as of the abbots at Constantinople; he was obliged to cause large sums of money to be distributed at court, funds which he found it impossible to collect without burdening his churches with debt, in order to gain over the hostilely-disposed nobles, and to reanimate the zeal of others for his party;* and yet, with all these intrigues, he could

* Cyrill's method of proceeding in such cases is, for the most part, disclosed by the letter of his archdeacon and syncell, Epiphanius, of which letter we have spoken before, and for the preservation of which we are indebted to the Synodicon, so often mentioned, c. 203. Theodoret. T. V. ep. 173. This letter is addressed to the patriarch Maximianus of Constantinople. It is here said, Cyrill had written to Pulcheria, to several cubicularios and cubicularias. *Et directæ sunt benedictiones (εὐλογίαι, presents) such as were worthy of them.* An attempt was made to gain over one of the chief chamberlains, Chrysoretus, who was hostilely disposed, by sending him magnificent presents, ut tandem desisteret ab oppugnatione ecclesiæ. The patriarch of Constantinople was requested to entreat Pulcheria, ut iterum ponat animam suam pro Domino Christo, puto enim, quod nunc non satis curet pro Cyrillo, ut et omnes, qui sunt in palatio regis. The patriarch was to give them whatever their avarice demanded, (so I would restore the sense according to a probably necessary emendation of the Latin text,) although they had already received presents enough, (et quicquid avaritiæ eorum deest, præsta iis, quanquam non desint et ipsis diversæ benedictiones,) that Pulcheria might be induced to write emphatically to the patriarch John, that no further mention must be made of that godless man (Nestorius).

not succeed in inducing an individual to lend him any hand in pressing his anathemas upon the other party. On the contrary, he felt himself obliged to adopt towards them a milder language, which could not be honourably meant on his part.*

On the other hand; the patriarch John of Antioch was not disposed to defend any longer the cause of Nestorius against the hatred which ever continued to be more strongly expressed against him at the court at Constantinople. To maintain the more moderate Antiochian system of faith, *i. e.*, the doctrine of the real distinction of the two natures in opposition to the Egyptian Monophysitism, was the point of greatest interest with him. Cyrill now doubtless understood that it would be necessary for him to purchase the acquiescence of the Orientals in the condemnation of Nestorius, and their consent to the ordination of the new patriarch Maximianus at Constantinople, by yielding something on his own side in articles of doctrine. If the Orientals could once be brought practically to recognize as valid the judgment pronounced by the council of Cyrill, the approbation of the doctrinal principles on which this judg-

Various influential court ladies were to be called upon to cooperate towards the same end. The abbot Dalmatius (see above) must protest earnestly before the emperor and the chamberlains, in the name of religion, so as to alarm their consciences. Sanctissimum Dalmatium abbatem roga, ut et imperatori mandet, terribili eum conjuratione constringens, et ut cubicularios omnes constringat, ne illius memoria ulterius fiat. It is worthy of notice, that even the abbot Eutyches, whose name afterwards became so famous, and who, it would appear, therefore, was one of the tools of the Cyrillian party, was here called upon to act. Appended to the letter there was a list of persons to whom presents had been sent from Alexandria, that the patriarch of Constantinople might see how much the Alexandrian church had interested itself in his cause, (for it was only in case the sentence of deposition against Nestorius continued valid that he could retain his office,) in so much that the clergy at Alexandria mourned over the poverty brought by these troubles upon the Alexandrian church. Neither should he, on his own part, be sparing of the property of his church, to satisfy the avarice of those who troubled the church at Alexandria. The patriarch should, without delay, beseech Pulcheria that Lausius might be made lord chamberlain, so that the power of Chrysoretes might be destroyed, et sic dogma nostrum roboretur. Such were the artifices of episcopal intrigue.

* L. c. Quicquid videtur reprehensibile esse, zelo et calore circa Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, qui abnegatus sit a Nestorio, dictum esse. Or that the anathemas contained a doctrine which could not be comprehended by every one, but only by the more practised. See ep. 98, T. V. Theodoret.

ment was based would easily follow, and by degrees everything at variance with the Egyptian system of doctrine might be declared to be a Nestorian heresy. The negotiations of a certain bishop, Paul of Emesa, who came to Alexandria as a deputy of the Orientals, contributed in a special manner to bring about an agreement which had been prepared in this way; for he himself took particular pains to further the matter, as he was very solicitous for the honour of being the author of peace, and for this reason promised more than he was warranted to do by his instructors. Thus Cyrill was exempted from the necessity of expressly recalling his anathemas; and, on the other hand, he was induced to subscribe a confession of faith laid before him by the bishop Paulus, which was in no respect different from that which had been set forth by the patriarch John at the council of Ephesus in the name of the Orientals, to vindicate their orthodoxy (see above *), by which the title “mother of God” was applied to Mary in the sense that two natures were united in Christ, while each still remained pure and unmixed in its individuality. On the other hand, the patriarch John acquiesced in the condemnation of Nestorius, and recognized the ordination which had been consummated by the Cyrillian party as good and valid.

This compact, struck in the year 432, which was a mere work of policy, and not the result of any reconciliation of doctrinal antagonisms in a natural and harmonious manner, experienced the usual fate of such outward and artificial combinations. *In concealing the schism which still continued to exist within, it merely served to call forth new divisions.* The men of both parties who regarded the dogmatic interest as of greater importance than the political, were dissatisfied with it. Cyrill was accused by the zealots of his own party of betraying those doctrines which he had, till now, opposed to Nestorianism, and not without reason; for Nestorius himself would doubtless have been induced to recognize the predicate *θεότοκος* applied to Mary, in the sense of such a union of the two natures as was denoted in the confession which lay at the basis of the agreement. Cyrill was able to defend himself against this accusation, only by alleging, first, that by severing,

* Theodoret has been named, without any sufficient reasons, as the author of this confession.

as he had already done before, the single positions of Nestorius from their connection with his whole system, he made an entirely different thing of Nestorianism from what it actually was; next, that he had artfully contrived to introduce into the distinctive theory of the creed which he had subscribed, a sense remote from that which was intended by its authors. What was said, for example, concerning the distinction of the two natures, he explained as follows: that it held good only of the distinction of the divine and human predicates; both of which, however, were to be referred to the one incarnate nature of the Logos; so that, in abstracto, two natures would be, indeed, distinguished from each other; but, in concreto, only one nature was to be recognized.* He attributed to the Antiochians, that he might be able to explain himself in agreement with them, a doctrine directly at variance with their entire system, that the *one* Christ consisted of two natures distinguishable *in conception*, but not of two natures distinguishable *in reality*.† Cyrill again, in order to defend himself with those who missed here the exactness of doctrinal expression, alluded to the great difficulty in general of finding suitable expressions for such matters in human language; ‡ but this observation must have prevented him, if other motives and interests had not been at work at that time, from passing so severe a judgment on the expressions of Nestorius.

The same Cyrill had, at an earlier period, during the negotiations with Aristolaus for a settlement of the differences, offered in excuse of his anathemas which were to be censured as heretical, that he had written what appeared so censurable, only from a glowing zeal for the Christ denied by Nestorius (see above). If this were honestly said, if it was not a mere subterfuge of theological chicanery, yet the same could also

* Cyrill, ep. ad Acacium. 'Ὡς ἐν ἐννοίαις δεχόμενοι, δύο μὲν φύσεις ἠνώσθαι φάμεν· μετὰ δὲ γὰρ τὴν ἕνωσιν, ὡς ἀντηρημένης ἡδὴ τῆς εἰς δύο διατομῆς, μίαν πιστεύομεν τὴν τοῦ υἱοῦ φύσιν.

† 'Οἱ δὲ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν ἀδελφοὶ τὰ μὲν ἐξ ὧν νοεῖται ὁ Χριστός, ὡς ἐν ψιλαῖς καὶ μόναις ἐννοίαις δεχόμενοι, φύσεων μὲν εἰρήκασι διάφοραν.

‡ Εἰ γὰρ τίσις δοκεῖ τῶν λήξεων ἢ συνθήκῃ καὶ τῶν νοημάτων ἡ πρόφορα τῆς ἰσχυρῆς ἂν ἀπρεβείας ἀπολιμπανίσθαι, θαυμάστον οὐδὲν δυσεμφωνήτα γὰρ τὰ σοῖαδε λίαν. When he adduces, in proof of this, the words of the prayer, Ephes. vi. 19, he shows again his habit of confounding what properly belongs to the simple preaching of the gospel with what belongs to the development of doctrinal conceptions.

have been alleged in this reference as an excuse for Nestorius. What to Cyrill appeared a denial of Christ, proceeded, on the part of Nestorius, and on the principles which he maintained, only from a well-meant zeal for the honour of Christ, believing, as he did, that the Cyrillian mode of expression involved a denial of the divine immutability.

A still greater dissatisfaction than this, which existed among the advocates of the Egyptian system of faith, was excited by the above-mentioned agreement among the zealous adherents of the Antiochian scheme of doctrine. A doctrinal interest, which overvalued the importance of precise dogmatic conceptions, was not less predominant among the latter than among the Alexandrians; and the interest in behalf of the dogmatic notions had vastly more influence, with many of them, than any sympathy which they felt in the case of their friend Nestorius suffering under the oppression of despotic will. As the Alexandrians saw everywhere the spectre of Photinianism, so, on the other hand, the Antiochian dogmatists saw everywhere the spectre of Apollinarianism, which seemed to them to rise up again in the system of Cyrill. To receive back Cyrill to the fellowship of the church appeared to them as frightful an enormity as if they should receive into the same fellowship Apollinaris himself.* Alexander of Hierapolis thought it intolerable that a monk, whose life he himself must confess was in accordance with the gospel, should be named in the prayer at the altar as one remaining in the com-

* We have a graphic illustration of this in a dream, which the bishop Andreas of Samosata, who also was, in the outset, a zealous opponent of the Cyrillian treaty of agreement, relates concerning himself. He dreamed that, in an assembly of other bishops, his friend, the bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, told him that the heretic Apollinaris was still living. Andreas, in astonishment, asked him several times whether this was really so, and Alexander assured him that it was. All at once they entered a house, where Apollinaris, now extremely aged, lay upon a bed. And as they were about taking their seats by the bedside, he arose and distributed the elements of the supper. The patriarch John lay in the bed, and received the elements from his hand, and then next Alexander himself. But Andreas of Samosata said indignantly to himself: "What accommodation to circumstances is this? It is a sin against the Holy Ghost. It is trifling with the incarnation of our Lord." With these words he awoke, and gave earnest expression to the wish that this dream might not after all prove true—in other words that Apollinaris of Alexandria, who had re-appeared, so to speak, in Cyrill, might not bring over all to his own views. Ep. 48, l. c. 706.

munion of the church; and he gave himself no rest, as he informs us, until this practice was abolished.*

Among those who in the Syrian church disapproved of this coalition, there was still manifested, however, a difference of judgment, according as they were disposed generally by natural temperament either to moderation or to extravagant zeal; and according as they had seized the system of doctrine taught by Theodore of Mopsuestia in a more stern and exclusive, or in a more mild and tolerant manner. The former, such as Theodoret and Andreas of Samosata, were, it is true, satisfied on the whole with the doctrinal explanations of Cyrill. They doubtless rejoiced, too, and saw in it the governing hand of divine grace, that Cyrill had been constrained to distinguish two natures in Christ, and to acknowledge that his sufferings belonged to the flesh, and that the deity was exalted above suffering.† Although it may unquestionably be gathered from the whole process of the matter, as we have described it, that in this case, where everything proceeded solely on grounds of impure worldly policy, there was no occasion for such joy and for such praise of the divine providence; since the supposition last named, that the deity was capable of suffering, had indeed never once entered Cyrill's thoughts, and the former distinction was, in fact, merely an outward accommodation in terms, which Cyrill employed in a different sense from that which was intended by his opponents.

But neither in the sentence of deposition passed on Nestorius, nor in the condemnation of his doctrines, did they believe they could acquiesce with a good conscience. "So vaguely to condemn the doctrine of Nestorius," said Theodoret, "was nothing more nor less than to condemn the doctrine of piety."‡ The patriarch John had, it is true, in his letter to the emperor, in which he declared his consent to the agreement, no doubt purposely expressed himself in such a way as that he could refer the condemnation, not to the *whole doctrine* of Nestorius, but only to that which he had taught *foreign from the apos-*

* L. c. ep. 145, p. 823.

† Theodoret. ep. 73, l. c. Naturarum differentiam clara prædicant voce, et passiones carni coaptantes, impassibilem divinam confirmant esse naturam.

‡ Ep. 50. Quod indeterminate anathematizare Nestorii doctrinam, idem sit, quod anathematizare pietatem.

tolic doctrine ;*—in which sense, one might, indeed, unhesitatingly subscribe the condemnation of every human doctrine. But this very indefiniteness in a dogmatic explanation appeared to the more rigid among the Orientals as a dishonourable subterfuge ;† and they could the less be satisfied with it, because they were well aware in what sense Cyrill interpreted what had been left undetermined. On the other hand, Theodoret offered to subscribe any form of condemnation, by which men might be distinctly placed on their guard against the charges commonly brought against the Antiochian system of doctrine—a sentence of condemnation against those who divided the one Lord Jesus Christ into two Sons, and those who denied his divinity.‡

But the acquiescence in the sentence of deposition on Nestorius appeared to them to be an unjustifiable wrong. It seemed to them a contradiction to pardon the man who had been constantly sowing discord, and who had at last with difficulty been brought to assent to the orthodox confession, but to sacrifice him who from his youth up had taught the same right doctrine. They declared that they could consent to the unjust and wicked sentence of the holy bishop, neither with hand, tongue, nor heart.§ These declarations of Theodoret had, however, been so construed, as if he had proved unfaithful to the conviction earlier expressed by him ; as though he had yielded through the fear of man and to preserve his bishopric, and for this reason had acknowledged the formula subscribed by Cyrill to be satisfactory. This suspicion against Theodoret having been excited by some persons in the mind of Nestorius himself, the former wrote him a letter in defence of his conduct. || “ Very gladly,” he said, “ would he lay down an office which he found burdened with so many cares, and make his retreat to the cloister. Nestorius, therefore,

* *Quæcunque ab eo aliene ac peregrine dicta sunt contra apostolicam doctrinam.* His words in the letter to the emperor, and the commentary of Theodoret, ep. 128, *Anathematismus non indefinite, sed cum quadam determinatione positus, modicam quandam præbet consolationem.*

† See the letter of the Orientals to the Roman bishop Sixtus, in the *Synodicon*, published by Lupus, c. 117. They say of the patriarch John : *Sic et accusatione ac demonstratione defecit, ut nec diceret, illam sive illam anathematizo sententiam, sed ait : quidquid ab eo impie dictum est.* Dum certe aperte dicere debuisset, ut ab eo sensu, quisque cautior redderetur.

‡ Ep. 50, p. 708.

§ Ep. 59.

|| Ep. 102.
N 2

ought not to allow himself to be persuaded that, from love to his bishopric, he had received with his eye shut the letter of Cyrill as in correspondence with the true faith. He could not say otherwise, consistently with the truth, than that he had not found anything in it which was heretical: although he, no less than others, detested, in the author of that letter, the disturber of the general peace. And he hoped and trusted, that on this score no punishment awaited him at the day of judgment, since the just Judge looked upon the heart." "But to the measures," he added, "which unrighteously and wickedly have been set on foot against you, I will not be induced to give my consent, even though they should cut off both my hands; for I hope that the divine grace will aid me, and strengthen the weakness of my soul."

But the zealots of this party, such as Alexander of Hierapolis and Meletius of Mopsuestia, were not satisfied that even so much should be yielded as had already been done. They still persisted in demanding of Cyrill an express revocation of his anathemas. They could see nothing in Cyrill's letter but his old erroneous doctrine artfully concealed; and when the above-cited letter, in which he had vindicated himself to his friends against the reproach of denying his previous convictions, came to their knowledge, sufficient proof was unquestionably furnished them to turn to shame the triumph of the patriarch John over the conversion of Cyrill.* As they had already, at the council of Ephesus, declared against the unconditional application of the predicate θεότοκος to Mary, so, too, they were dissatisfied with the new application of the term according to the articles of agreement there drawn up. The bishop Alexander, in declaring his dissent, proceeded on the ground of a distinction between the *homoletic* and the strictly dogmatical use of language, which we have already noticed as constituting a distinguishing characteristic of the Syrian church-teachers. "We cannot complain," he writes,† "of those preachers who, in their festival discourses, may have imprudently called Mary the mother of God, or the Jews God's murderers, and the like, which may have been said by orthodox men in an unsuspecting manner; for the very reason that it was in nowise their intention thereby to define doctrines.

* See the letters of Meletius, ep. 76 and ep. 121. † Ep. 78.

But it was quite otherwise with a strict form of dogmatic expression, and especially after Cyrill, in his anathemas, had expressed the erroneous doctrine which served to give currency to this predicate, and by the same document had spread it far and wide." These bishops, for the reasons just stated, not only rejected the agreement concluded upon, and not only continued therefore to consider Cyrill as excluded from the communion of the church, but they also excommunicated those who had received that agreement. A whole synod, in Cilicia Secunda, passed a decree of this sort; the members declaring they were ready to suffer anything rather than enter into fellowship with error or with the teachers of error. The patriarch John might doubtless have been able, by moderate conduct, to gain over the more mildly disposed among the Orientals, if he had refrained from urging upon them an acquiescence in the sentence which deposed Nestorius—the course actually pursued afterwards; but, by the vehemence with which he conducted himself towards all opponents, he alienated from him even this more moderate class.

The patriarch John took occasion, from these disputes, to indulge himself in many encroachments on the administration of affairs in foreign dioceses; he furthered the promotion of unworthy men, disposed to serve him as his instruments, to episcopal stations which he had no authority to fill. Thus he made himself hated, and thus it was his own fault that the party of his opponents augmented, and the worthiest bishops of Syria withdrew from all fellowship with him. A schism followed, not only in the Antiochian church diocese, but also in other parts of the Eastern church which were subject to the patriarch of Constantinople. The discontented from all quarters attached themselves to the opposition party of Eastern Asia; and thus was formed an association of bishops who stood opposed to the three patriarchs of the East. To the same circle belonged the bishops of that portion of Syria which touches on the Euphrates, of the two provinces of Cilicia, of Cappadocia Secunda, of Bithynia, Thessaly, and Mœsia.*

Meanwhile, notwithstanding all the pains of the Cyrillian party, the memory of Nestorius has not been wholly effaced

* See the letter written in the name of these schismatic bishops to the Roman bishop, Sixtus II., in Lupus, l. c. c. 117.

from the minds of his devoted community at Constantinople. This became evident after the death of the patriarch Maximianus in 433. In many parts of the city vast multitudes assembled, and with loud shouts demanded Nestorius again for their bishop; threatening, unless he were restored to them, to set fire to the patriarchal church.* Yet such movements in favour of a man once hated by the dominant court party could do him no service, but, on the contrary, only tend to excite still more the rage of his enemies, who grudged him such love of the people. In the manner in which the vacant patriarchate was once more filled, appeared the influence of the party opposed to Nestorius, for that very Proclus who had first stood forth as his opponent (see above) was named patriarch; and this man leagued himself with Cyrill and John of Antioch, to enforce everywhere the recognition of the agreement struck between the church of Eastern Asia and that of Egypt, which had been made the basis of the peace of the church. The patriarch John, who by this alliance obtained great power, resorted at first to means of benevolence, to presents and pecuniary aid, for the purpose of gaining over the poor churches of Syria, which were burdened with debts;† and next, where he could not accomplish his ends in *this* way, he tried to intimidate by threats. All being to no purpose, he exerted himself to procure an imperial edict against the obstinate bishops. Already he had contrived, by bribing the quæstor Domitian, to obtain such a decree; but those bishops whom it was wished to expel stood so high in the esteem of their communities, that the execution of such measures against them might draw after it very disastrous consequences. The pretorian prefect Taurus represented to the emperor that the cities would be ruined, and that the empire, otherwise (by the bad management of its resources) growing impoverished every day, would here also lose one source of its revenues;‡ and the execution of the imperial ordinance was therefore put off for the present. The quæstor who

* Procli Synodica, l. c. 895.

† As may be gathered from the words of the bishop Alexander of Hierapolis, ep. 143: Non habemus pecunias et munera et naves plenas oneribus, quæ mittamus. . . Illis armatur multitudo contra veritatem.

‡ Futurus ex hoc eversio urbium,—quod qualis est Thracia, talis e Cilicia erit, quæ pæne sola remansit ad tributa solvenda, ep. 105, l. c.

had obtained this ordinance for the patriarchs, in the meantime resorted to a trick, in order to induce the Syrian bishops to yield. He informed them that this ordinance was signed by the emperor, and was to be published, but that he had for awhile withheld its publication, in order to see whether they might not be induced to compliance by arguments before it should be necessary to resort to extreme measures.* At length the imperial decree against the disturbers of the peace and the corrupters of the doctrines of faith, who employed religion as a pretext—by whom, however, could be meant no others than those Syrian bishops who were opposed to the articles of agreement—was actually published; and men who for a long series of years, without mingling like others in the impure worldly business of those times, had consecrated all their labours, without earthly splendour and enjoyment, solely to their spiritual office, were now to be forcibly separated from the communities in which they were cordially loved and respected, because the arbitrary will of a few individuals found it possible through the court to rule over the church.†

When these threatening commands were made known to the bishop Theodoret, he was at first resolved to forsake all, and retire to the cloister in which he had received his spiritual education; but the pious monks of his community urged him to enter into new negotiations with the patriarch John, so as to preserve his church without detriment to his conscience. Theodoret foresaw that, if he declined to obey the emperor's decree, he would be forced away from the community where his labours were blessed, and some unworthy person would be substituted in his place. He considered it therefore to be his duty, so far as he could so do without denying his own convictions and without detriment to his conscience, to yield, in order to subserve a higher interest of the church; and as the

* See his letter to the bishop Helladius of Tarsus, ep. 106.

† In the letter which the magister militum orientis sent to all the bishops concerned, in order to the carrying into execution of the emperor's command, it was said: *Necesse est, ut aut communices Joanni episcopo catholicæ ecclesiæ, ut ablatis contentionibus sancta ecclesia quiete fruatur ac pace, quam peperit (which John introduced by means of his articles of agreement) aut contendens, formam divinitus datam (the penalty defined in the imperial *sacra*) subire cogaris. Privaberis enim urbe, privaberis et ecclesia si meliori sorte obedire et assentiri noluers.*

patriarch John released him from giving in his acquiescence in the judgment pronounced on Nestorius, and as he himself had already testified his satisfaction with the doctrinal part of the articles of agreement, he could at present, with a good conscience, comply with the prescribed conditions.* The patriarch John now endeavoured, through Theodoret's mediation,† to gain over also the other Syrian bishops; and Theodoret himself was moved, by his zeal for the best good of the church, and his friendship for his old colleagues involved in this controversy, to exert himself to the utmost to bring about a general reconciliation and union. He urged his old friends with the most pressing arguments, and among others wrote thus to the bishop Helladius of Tarsus:‡ “He assuredly ought not without good cause to expose the flock entrusted to him to destruction; the purity of doctrine had certainly been secured; to participate in wrong-doing was a thing to which they were forced by no one. The righteous Judge would not punish them for the injustice of others. It was high time to put an end to disputes, and to unite the churches once more together.” But in vain were all these representations and entreaties to the three men, distinguished for their firmness of character, Meletius of Mopsuestia, Alexander of Hierapolis, and Helladius of Tarsus—men whose souls strong in faith, and superior to all human fear in resisting the despotic caprice which would subject everything to itself, deserve respect, notwithstanding their narrow dogmatic zeal. They were firmly resolved not to grant Cyrill the fellowship of the church under any other condition than that he should revoke the system of doctrine expressed in his anathemas, and acknowledge Nestorius as a catholic bishop. All other yielding was the same in their eyes as to purchase the peace of the church with the denial of the truth and the approbation of injustice. They held it to be their duty to remain faithful, under all trials, to the pastoral calling which had been entrusted to them; but they believed themselves justified also to give up their authority to govern, in order to remain true to their convictions. They were men who had for a long series of years administered their office in so disinterested a spirit that, when obliged to relin-

* See ep. 126. Theodoret. l. c., together with other letters of his in that collection.

† See ep. 103.

‡ Ep. 138.

quish their posts, and to leave their flocks, they could take nothing with them for their journey and for the means of subsistence, but had to depend entirely on the charity of their friends.* The bishop Alexander answered his friend Theodoret after his repeated remonstrances: "I solemnly adjure you by the most Holy Trinity to press me no longer, for my hope is in the Crucified. I am already waiting for those who are to drive me from my place with so great joy, that, had I any other gold besides the utensils of the church, I would give them for that a larger present than for any joyful tidings they could bring me. Give yourself no further trouble, therefore, but only pray for me."

As Theodoret could effect nothing in this way, he at length betook himself to a man, in defence of whose innocence those common friends were in truth particularly zealous, the injured Nestorius, and besought him that he would himself represent to the bishop Alexander how sorely he failed against the law of love, in having respect solely to what concerned himself, not to what was for the advantage of many others; that he ought not to hesitate, if it were necessary, even to commit a trifling sin, in order to save many from sin, and lead them to salvation.† On the one side, we here see, in the man of moderation, the subjective caprice of his system of morals, justifying the means by the end—a thing which we frequently remark among the Orientals; on the other, we see in the zealot the ethical severity which would not acknowledge the principle that the end sanctifies the means. When Theodoret failed in this way to accomplish his purpose, he begged the patriarch John, in the most touching appeal, that he would not allow force to be employed against the venerable man. "Time," he said, "would soon make him more pliant; and even if this should not be the case, yet it could do no harm, for his doctrine accorded with the faith of the church, and he would move on quietly in his own field of labour, without seeking to make any disturbance. The patriarch John would make himself extremely unpopular if he undertook to do anything against the venerable old man, of whom he himself had once said, that all must bear him; while, on the contrary, by pardoning him, he

* As the bishop Alexander writes, ep. 147: *Ex his quæ mihi direxerunt amici habeo ad animalium conductionem.*

† Ep. 148. *Pusillum delinquant, ut a multo delicto cæteros liberet.*

would secure the esteem and love of all." * But these representations made no impression whatever on the patriarch, who was determined at all hazards to enforce ecclesiastical obedience, and to restore unity to the church. The pious old man was torn from his devoted flock. This occasioned a universal lamentation throughout the city ; the churches were closed, and it was necessary to open them by force. Loud complaints and reproaches were heard from all quarters against those who had determined to deprive his flock of their old spiritual father. Young and old, women and men, united in petitioning the imperial governor of the province of Eastern Asia, the Comes Orientis, and the patriarch John, to allow their old bishop to end his few remaining days quietly in the midst of them—without him they could not live.† The patriarch John, however, was not to be softened by such representations. He answered the church at Hierapolis in a cold and haughty official tone, assuring them that their bishop must attribute all that he suffered only to his own stubborn self-will ; and he represented it as a great crime in him, that he refused to enter into any negotiations with those men (the bishops) by whose prayers the world is saved.‡ Yet he added, that, if Alexander would desist from his wonted pride, and reform, he would joyfully send him back to them again.

A similar fate befel the bishop Meletius of Mopsuestia. The Comes Titus had urged him likewise voluntarily to submit to the imperial ordinance ; he opposed to him the common argument of the entire Christian world—the usual argument of the party in power. As it was God's will that all men should be saved, it was not to be thought of that the judgment of an individual should stand against the common consent of all. To this Meletius gave him a becoming reply : " He was right," he wrote to him, " in what he said concerning the divine will, but it was evident that human will did not always accord with the divine : for God had allowed men endowed with a rational soul to be masters of their own will ; and hence it had often happened, as the history of the Old and New Testament showed, that a few men, inspired with the right disposition towards God, had defended the truth against

* Ep. 150.

† See the report of the judge of the secunda Euphratesia, ep. 166.

‡ Quorum precibus mundus ipse salvatur.

the multitude. So now, too, God would not reject the few who clove to him with all their love, and on this account had to endure from the multitude sworn against them, disgrace, persecution, and exile; and pardon me," he continued, "I entreat you, if I do not find it in my power to deceive my own conscience. As soon as I see the command signed by the emperor's own hand I shall leave the church at once, just as I am, still praising God as before. I am ready, through God's grace, not only to give up the church, but even to die a thousand deaths, rather than to sin against my conscience, in respect of our Lord Christ." When now the emperor's command was put in execution, and another bishop, whom the patriarch John had resolved to thrust on the church, was installed in the place of Meletius, the whole community testified their grief and sympathy. All were for having Meletius alone for their bishop, and would recognize no other. These commotions gave the patriarch John occasion to accuse Meletius at Constantinople as a violator of the imperial laws and a disturber of the peace, and to propose that he should be expelled from the whole province of Cilicia. He was banished to Melitene, in Armenia, and quietly resigned himself to his lot, which he accepted as one ordained by a higher wisdom, and inflicted by the hand of God, for whose cause he believed he was contending.

We will now for a moment turn aside from contemplating the further development of these events, in order to cast a glance at the final lot of that pious man, Nestorius himself, who undeservedly became an object of abhorrence to many of his contemporaries and to posterity. As may be gathered from what has already been narrated, even the old friends of Nestorius, though they belonged to the same doctrinal school with him, had gone over to the side of those who pronounced upon him the sentence of condemnation; and in the end they must persuade themselves, in order to justify this step to their conscience, that Nestorius had preached dangerous errors. But the zeal in behalf of such a conviction, which had proceeded merely out of self-persuasion, is for the most part wont to incline but so much the more strongly to heat and violence. No voice of commanding influence spoke openly and loudly in behalf of that Nestorius who became every day more hated at the imperial court, the man whom the emperor Theodosius, in

his edicts, had compared with an Arius, † Porphyry, a Simon Magus. Theodoret, and those of like mind with him, must be contented, indeed, that they had merely been spared the necessity of signing the condemning sentence pronounced against Nestorius. But his enemies did not cease persecuting him; for they grudged the honourable ease which he enjoyed in the cloister, and the sympathy which, from time to time, he still met with; and they dreaded the influence which he might exert in his narrow circle, and from thence extend over a still wider compass. The Roman bishop Cœlestinus had already, by a letter to the emperor Theodosius, A.D. 432, called upon him to remove the man who had been condemn'd by the judicial sentence of all the priests, and who still persisted in his blasphemous errors,* from all intercourse with society, that it might be put out of his power to lead others astray.† This demand, however, did not as yet produce the intended effect. Nestorius continued for four years to enjoy undisturbed repose and esteem in the cloister of Euprepus, which lay before the gates of Antioch, only two stadia from the city. But when John and Cyrill of Alexandria had now made it their aim to cause the sentence pronounced against him to be universally recognized, it could not but be extremely vexatious to them to be aware of his residence on such a spot, which was so convenient for maintaining a correspondence with the whole Syrian church. By their influence, therefore, Nestorius, in the year 435, was torn from the repose of his cloister, and condemned to exile. By the first edict, the town of Petra, in Arabia, was fixed upon as the place of his banishment.‡ But this edict was not so executed. Perhaps it was a mitigation of the punishment, that he was, instead of this, exiled to one of the Oases, probably the great Oasis of Egypt.§ Hordes of Libyan barbarians, known under the name of Blemmyans, falling upon this district and laying everything waste with fire and sword, made Nestorius a prisoner. They had compassion on him, set him at liberty with several others, and warned him themselves to leave that place of residence, because other hordes

* In prædicatione sacrilega perdurantem.

† Ut facultatem aliquos perdendi non habeat.

‡ The imperial edict in Harduin. Concil. I. c. 1669.

§ When Socrates wrote the seventh book of his church history, he was still in that place. Vid. Socrat. hist. eccles. vii. 34.

would soon follow in their train. Nestorius now betook himself to the town of Panapolis in Egypt, and from thence he wrote to the prefect of Thebais. He informed him that it was not his intention to escape, that he might furnish no occasion for calumny; he awaited what might be determined concerning him according to the laws. But he begged him at the same time not to leave him a prey to the machinations of wicked men, lest it might be lamented in all future times, that it was better to be a prisoner to barbarians than to take refuge at the throne of the Roman emperor.* But these representations availed him nothing. Perhaps the prefect was the mere tool of Egyptian fanaticism and blind heresy-hatred. The old man, whose physical powers were already enfeebled by age and by his many misfortunes, was, at the command of the governor, without the least show of compassion, dragged about from one place to another, by a guard of soldiers composed of barbarian allies, to the borders of Egypt. He therefore wrote to the governor a second letter, which, to judge from a fragment preserved to us by the church-historian Evagrius, was composed, like the first, with dignity and composure, although the heart of an Evagrius was so steeled by the power of dogmatic fanaticism, that he had no sense to perceive this, but saw in the expressions of a dignified spirit, which had not been bowed to servility by all its misfortunes, nothing but expressions of pride and obstinacy.† Having demanded of the governor that, after being so dragged about, he might at length be allowed some repose, and that his case might be reported to the emperor, he concluded in the following words: "Thus I counsel you, as a father would his son; but if you receive *these* words, as you did my first, with displeasure, then act according to your own good pleasure, if so be that your good pleasure has more weight with you than arguments of reason." Amidst the sufferings of his exile, Nestorius enjoyed sufficient composure of mind to write a history of his controversy, and of his fortunes resulting therefrom, especially designed to vindicate himself against the reproaches made against him by friends and

* The words of Nestorius in the fragment of his letter preserved by Evagrius in his church history, I. 7, are: *ἵνα μὴ πάσαις ἐκ τούτου γένῃαισιν παραγοῇται κρίσιν εἶναι βαρβάρων αἰχμαλώτων ἢ πρόσφυγα βασιλείας Ῥωμαίων.*

† *Ὁ μὲν δὲ ὡς ἂν ἑαυτὸς σωφρονήσας.*

enemies; which work he seems to have entitled, the representation of his *Tragedy*.* In this work, it would appear, he exposed with a vehemence of indignation which might easily be excused, the intrigues of Cyrill; while he expressed himself with more mildness concerning others, who, according to his own opinion, had only been deceived by Cyrill.†

As to the manner, however, in which Nestorius ended his life, no certain and definite accounts have come down to us.

* See the citations from it in Evagrius, l. I. c. 7, and in the Synedicon published by Lupus, c. VI. Lupi opera, T. VII. f. 26. That the work bore the title of "Tragedy" is reported by Ebedjesu, a Nestorian metropolitan of the fourteenth century, in his list of Syrian ecclesiastical writers in *Assemani bibliotheca Orientalis*, T. III. p. i. f. 36. This work of Nestorius has unfortunately not come down to us, unless, perhaps, it may be somewhere found in a Syrian translation. But Irenæus, the friend of Nestorius already mentioned, who accompanied him as a count of the empire to Ephesus, on account of his friendship for Nestorius, fell into disgrace with the emperor, lived for some time in exile, and then, after having been ordained by his friends, bishop of Tyre, was deposed again by command of the emperor. This Irenæus composed a work, full of zeal for the cause of Nestorius, treating of the persecutions which he suffered, and of the history of the church in his times, which likewise bore the title of "Tragedy." In this work he made use of the history compiled by his friend Nestorius, from which he often quoted; but we have to regret, that this tragedy of Irenæus has also failed to come down to us. But an unknown author, probably a North African, in the times of the emperor Justinian, or soon after, in writing on the controversies respecting the three articles, of which we shall speak hereafter, has brought together copious extracts from this work, with other important records which he hunted up at Constantinople, all relating to these disputes. These are contained in the Synodicon, first published by Lupus, from a manuscript in the abbey of Monte Cassino. There is another printed copy of the manuscript in Mansi Concil. T. V.

† Cœlestin, being an unlearned Roman bishop, he excused on the grounds that he could not possess any exact insight into doctrines (*simpliciorum, quam qui posset vim dogmatum subtilius penetrare*), and that he had suffered himself to be deceived by the garbled quotations of Cyrill. Nestorius moreover acknowledged here, that it was himself who first proposed the assembling of a synod at Ephesus; a step, however, for which he was reproached by his friends. In answer to the charge that he made Christ a mere man, he appeals to the fact, that immediately after his ordination, he got a new law to be passed against those who maintained this, as well as against other heretics. Nestorius, then, here avows himself as the author of the severe law against the heretics, which appeared in the very year in which he entered upon the patriarchal dignity, in the year 428, and is to be found in the *Codex Theodosianus*, l. XVI. Tit. V. l. 65.

The church historians of this period, who represent all the misfortunes which befel the persecuted man as being a divine judgment on the blasphemer, here give us rhetorical fustian in place of simple and credible history.*

We now return from the personal history of Nestorius, to trace the consequences which resulted from the Nestorian disputes.

Theodoret and his friends had, it is true, as we have already remarked, adopted the Alexandrian articles of agreement, only with such restrictions as to secure themselves against any violation of conscience; but it was easy to foresee, that they would not be suffered long to enjoy that immunity; that it would soon be declared to be a mere subterfuge, which they had left open to themselves, so as not to be under the necessity of renouncing Nestorianism. The new severer measures against all the adherents of Nestorius, and all so called Nestorians, might easily pave the way for this.

In the year 435 appeared new laws, by which it was ordained that the Nestorians should for the future be called Simonians; that all the writings of Nestorius should be burnt; that those who should copy, preserve, or read them, should be punished in the severest manner; and that all bishops who ventured to defend the doctrines of Nestorius should be deposed. All meetings of Nestorians for divine worship were strictly forbidden. The tribune Aristolaus was a second time sent to the Antiochian church diocese, for the purpose of seeing these laws carried into execution, and of enforcing everywhere the condemnation of Nestorius and of his doctrines.† Many bishops, who until now had acceded to the articles of agreement only under the above-mentioned limitation, submitted to these new ordinances. Others, as Theodoret, remained firm by their former declarations; and Cyrill therefore accused them before the patriarch John and the tribune Aristolaus, as men who had

* Evagrius cites words of a church historian, who says that Nestorius, after his tongue—no doubt in punishment for his blasphemies—had been gnawed away by worms, went to the greater eternal punishment of another world.

† Cyrill. ep. 166 to Aristolaus, decretum, per quod præcipitur, ut universi episcopi orientis anathematizarent impium *Nestorium* et omnes ejus contra Christum blasphemias dicere Simonianam seu Nestorianam hæresin; and ep. 179 to the same.

adopted the articles of peace only in a deceitful manner, and as being secret Nestorians.* In general, Cyrill was already making preparations, by degrees, to condemn, under the name of Nestorianism, everything which was opposed to his own system of doctrine, although he did not as yet come out openly with this project. Already he denounced those who condemned the doctrines of Nestorius only in appearance, without actually renouncing them. Nestorianism, he asserted, did not consist alone, as some pretended, in refusing to call Mary the mother of God.†

In the next place, what men called Nestorianism was, in fact, substantially nothing else than the doctrines of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The defenders of Nestorius and of his doctrines boasted, not without good reason, of being disciples of the great Theodore.‡ When therefore the Cyrillian party aimed at the total supplanting of Nestorianism, they believed their object would be completely accomplished only when the doctrines of Diodorus and Theodore should be condemned at the same time, as the proper fountain of Nestorianism. To Cyrill it very rightly appeared like a contradiction to condemn the doctrines of Nestorius, and to defend those of Theodore, who set forth the same, often in far harsher terms. In the veneration paid to those two Syrian fathers he saw only a pretext under which Nestorianism, while it was nominally condemned, might still continue to be defended.§ But it was a most difficult undertaking to induce the Syrian clergy, who had been accustomed, from their youth, to name those men with the greatest reverence as the fathers and teachers of the church, to approve a decree by which they were publicly condemned. True, the partisans of Cyrill among the Syrian monks and clergy, and a certain bishop, Rabulus of Edessa, who had joined them, made trial of carrying through such a sentence of condemna-

* Cyrill. ep. 180.

† See ep. 179 to Aristolaus, and ep. 167 to John.

‡ See, for example, the language of the bishop Miletius, ep. 152, opp. Theodoret. T. V. p. 832. *Fidem apostolicam et a patribus traditam, quam a magno Theodoro accepimus.*

§ See the letter of Cyrill to the bishop Acacius of Melitene, opp. T. V. p. ii. f. 197, where he says of the Orientals: *Ἐποπλαττόμενοι γὰρ τὰ Νεστορίου μίσουν, ἐτίμησιν ἄλλα συγκεροτοῦσι τρόπον. τὰ Θεοδοίου θαυμάζοντες, καίτοι τὴν, ἴσην, μᾶλλον δι' αἰτίων νοσοῦντα ὑπερβείαν.*

tion: but the general and determined resistance which they experienced, proved how impracticable any project of this kind still was in the Syrian church at large; and the opposition called forth thereby contributed to the formation, from the Syrian church, of an independent Nestorian church-party in Persia, concerning the rise of which we shall speak more particularly in a separate section.

A certain abbot, Maximus, who was one of the most violent opponents of Nestorianism, excited in the Syrian church, by a project of this sort, the greatest indignation even among the laity, among whom the character of those men stood in the highest veneration. In the midst of the assembled communities, the cry was heard, "Long live the faith of Theodore! We believe as Theodore believed,"—and in the Antiochian church, stones were thrown at that abbot.* The Cyrillian party made one more attempt to enforce, by means of the emperor and the patriarch Proclus, the condemnation of those Syrian church-teachers; as indeed Cyrill himself, when he sent to the emperor his explanation of the Nicene creed in opposition to Nestorianism, had invited him to attempt this, at least in an indirect manner, having in his accompanying letter described Diodorus and Theodore, in the harshest expressions, as being the fathers of those blasphemies, and declared that under their name Nestorianism was revived.† But the patriarch Proclus was nevertheless too prudent, and too decidedly the friend of peace,‡ to be willing, for the sake of gratifying the passions of zealots and the ambition of Cyrill, to cast the church into new turmoils, the consequences of which could not be estimated, and which could be more easily excited than quelled. He endeavoured, while it was yet time, to check the violent commotions which were already on the point of breaking out.

The Armenian church having requested him, on occasion of these disputes, to give his own judgment, he addressed to them a dogmatic exposition, which acquired great authority in the Greek church.¶ With this, he united certain anathemas on several propositions akin to Nestorianism, which

* See Cyrill's letter to Acacius, bishop of Melitene, p. 197.

† See this letter of Cyrill, opp. Theodoret, T. V. p. 854.

‡ See Socrat. hist. eccles. VII. c. 41.

¶ Procli Tomus ad Armenos.

were supposed to have been drawn from the writings of Theodore, but in which he had wisely omitted to mention the author by name. Yet the deputies who were the bearers of this letter of the patriarch to the Syrian church, one of whom was the above-mentioned zealot Maximus, did not exercise the same prudence. On the contrary, the opportunity was welcome to them by which they were enabled, under the authority of the patriarch of the imperial residence, to demand the condemnation of the propositions of Theodore; and they took the liberty, therefore, of affixing his name to them. As the propositions now appeared under the name of Theodore, the proposal to subscribe these articles of condemnation was received, in the Syrian church diocese, with the most violent indignation. The patriarch John of Antioch wrote to Cyrill, that the bishops of this district would prefer to be burned, rather than to approve the condemnation of Theodore.* The bishops of the Antiochian patriarchate, assembled at Antioch, sent the most emphatic letters as well to the emperor as to the patriarchs Proclus and Cyrill. They declared that they could not possibly consent, for the sake of such isolated propositions, torn out of their proper connection,—just as, by a like proceeding, propositions which seemed not a whit less revolting might be extracted from the writings of the most venerated fathers,—to condemn after his death so great a church-teacher, who had so manfully contended for the defence of pure doctrine against so many errors; but even were it possible for them to be induced to such a step, yet they would meet the most determined resistance from their communities, who even now were ready to revolt at these proposals.† In their letter to the emperor, they express themselves with just indignation against the idea of condemning, after their death, men who, to the close of their lives, had served the church in the best possible manner. By such a course, no church-teacher could be safe; for as all were men, it was impossible that they should escape the censure of those who took pains to hunt up what-

* See the letter of Cyrill to the patriarch Proclus, opp. l. c. f. 200.

† See the fragment of this document addressed to the patriarch Proclus, in *Facund. Hermianens. defensio trium capitulorum*, l. VIII. at the beginning, opp. Sirmond. T. II. ed. Venet. f. 460, and all that remains to us of the transactions of this Antiochian council, in *Mansi. concil.* T. V. f. 1182.

ever was bad in them: indeed the declarations of the holy scriptures themselves were in various ways perverted by teachers of error.* Proclus wrote hereupon to the patriarch John,† that it had never entered his thoughts to condemn any man who had died in the communion of the church. He severely upbraided his deputies for overstepping the powers which had been entrusted to them; and he commanded them to take no step without the knowledge and approbation of the patriarch John, and to do all in their power to appease those commotions. The emperor himself issued an ordinance (sacra), addressed to the synod assembled at Antioch, in which he forbade everything which had been undertaken to disturb the peace of the church in those districts.† Even Cyrill thought it best at length to yield to the storm. In a letter to the patriarch Proclus, he declared that, to avoid disturbances, it was perhaps best to proceed no further, as the object to be accomplished was, after all, not so important; for by condemning the blasphemies of Nestorius, the kindred blasphemies of Theodore were in like manner also condemned. If Theodore were now living, and should persist in defending the blasphemies of Nestorius, or the things which he himself had written, the condemnation would reach also to himself personally; but as he had already gone to God,‡ it was sufficient, if nothing further was done than to condemn the false doctrines which were to be found in his writings, without mentioning his name.§

Yet although he must have been sensible, that a public condemnation of the writings and doctrines of Theodore could, under these circumstances, in no wise be enforced, yet his polemical zeal was not suffered to grow cool. He composed a work under the title, “There is but one Christ,” against the doctrine of Theodore, in which work he accused him of having written a great deal which savoured of the most extreme impiety,—of having denied the true deity of Christ, and of having made Christians the worshippers of man.|| After such attacks

* Fac. Herm. l. c. l. VIII. c. 3.

† The sacra in Facundus, l. c. l. VIII. c. 3.

‡ Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπεδημῶσι πρὸς θεῖον. A remarkable expression in the mouth of Cyrill, who made no scruple of condemning Nestorius to hell.

§ See opp. Cyrill. f. 200.

|| See the extracts from that work in the fifth act of the second œcumenical council of Constantinople. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 107.

upon the venerated teacher of the Syrian church, the Syrian church-teachers could not, of course, remain silent. Theodoret felt himself constrained to defend the memory of his instructor against these attacks; and, as we may gather from the fragments of this work,* he indulged himself in the same violence, and the same unwarrantable imputation of consequences, as his opponent had done.

Thus this new contention served but to excite afresh the rupture between the Alexandrian and the Syrian church. If we may trust to an ancient account, Cyrill was already laying the foundation of new plots against the Syrian church-party, which he so much hated, and was labouring to carry through his designs at the court,† when by his death, in the year 444, the church was delivered from this threatening danger.

* Which are preserved to us in the Latin translation, in the Collat. V. of the II. œcum. Concil. Constantinop. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 107.

† This may be gathered from the words of Theodoret, in his well-known letter to the patriarch of Antioch, on Cyrill's death; ep. 180, in opp. Theodoret. *Somniavit enim, sicut dicunt, et regiam urbem perturbare, et piis iterum dogmatibus repugnare et tuam sanctitatem accusare, utpote ea colentem.* Yet this letter is by many, since the time of Tillemont, (note 80 to his life of Cyrill, *Memoires* T. 14,) considered spurious, but for reasons which to us do not carry the force of conviction, and of which many derive their weight merely from the Catholic point of view at which Tillemont stands. That Theodoret should speak after this manner of Cyrill's character and of his death, cannot appear so surprising to those who, without prejudice, contemplate Cyrill and his relations to Theodoret. The sportive description of Cyrill's voyage to the world below is not to be reckoned a very strange thing, even in Theodoret; when, for instance, in allusion to Lucian's dialogues of the dead, he says, *Lætificavit quidem superstites illius discessio, contristavit vero forsitan mortuos, et timor est, ne prægravati ejus conversatione, iterum ad nos remittant, vel illos effugiat, qui cum abducunt.* For this reason, he says, it might be, that the patriarch had ordered a huge stone to be placed on his grave. In the world below, there was no farther occasion to fear danger from Cyrill's doctrines; not only those who were well informed in such matters, but even Nimrod and Pharaoh, would be disgusted with them, and stone him.

Any person who attempted to fabricate a letter under the name of Theodoret, would hardly have represented him as discoursing in so sportive and heathenish a style. He would rather have put into his mouth earnest denunciations in the language of the Old Testament. An allusion of this kind to Lucian's dialogues of the dead is much rather in the character of Theodoret, who was doubtless well versed in the study of the ancients. But as in this sportive style there is to be detected no

The death of Cyrill, however, served, only for the first moments, to promote the restoration of tranquillity in the Oriental church. What had been done during the episcopal adminis-

mark of bitterness or of revenge, so in the conclusion of the letter we find expressed the spirit of Christian charity, by which Theodoret was actuated, and which any person who, from motives of doctrinal interest, has interpolated a letter of this sort, would have found it difficult to imitate. For instance, after remarking how troubled his friends were with the thought that Cyrill was still to the last plotting evil, he adds, "May it be so ordered, by your prayers, that he may obtain mercy and forgiveness, and that the unmeasured grace of God may prevail over his wickedness." Tillemont supposes that the objections which Theodoret makes in this letter to Cyrill's system of faith are inconsistent with his mode of expressing himself with regard to Cyrill's doctrinal explanations in those articles of agreement. But these observations of Theodoret refer simply to the manner in which Cyrill had expressed himself in that confession of faith. From the later declarations of Cyrill, in his work against Theodore, Theodoret must doubtless have known that no change had really taken place in the views of Cyrill; and in his "Refutation" he had in fact repeated the charge of Apollinarianism and similar complaints against Cyrill. Neither does the manner in which Theodoret declares himself, in his eighty-third letter to Dioscurus respecting his relation to Cyrill, and especially respecting those writings of his which do not relate to the above-mentioned doctrinal differences, stand so directly at variance with the remarks in this letter. It is only necessary to pay some regard to the difference of circumstances, and to remember that the above letter was written in confidence to a friend, while this was intended for publication, and expressly pointed against the hostilely disposed official adherents of Cyrill; to which we must add, that the Orientals, according to their theory of the *οικονομία*, allowed themselves in many liberties, not to be reconciled with the strict laws of veracity.

But, if Theodoret really speaks of Cyrill in this letter as having died prematurely, it certainly could not have come from the hand of a contemporary, who must have known that Cyrill reached a good old age. But the reading by which he is made to say this cannot be correct, if for no other reason, because what is so expressed stands in manifest contradiction with the substance of the commencing words of the letter. The correct reading is evidently that of the Codex Paris: *Illum vero miserum et ad*; for this sense is required by the commencing words, while, in what follows, *et* may also be substituted instead of *sed*; or *sed*, which fitly marks the antithesis, may even be retained.

Finally, it would indeed be an anachronism, if this letter were addressed to the patriarch John of Antioch, but the entire contents of the letter are best suited to his successor Domnus, and we have only to suppose that the two names were confounded in the Latin translation, the only form in which this document has been preserved. Concil. œcumen. V. collat. V.

The fragment of a sermon which Theodoret is said to have preached

tration of Cyrill, the manner in which the disputes had been composed, contained in itself the seeds of new disorders ; and to bring these to a violent outbreak, the footsteps of Cyrill were followed by his successor Dioscurus, a man of unbounded ambition, and of an irascible, boisterous temperament, who was ready to adopt any means to accomplish his purposes—bribery, court intrigue, and deeds of violence of every sort.* This person once more resumed the plan which Cyrill, who had only yielded to circumstances, never lost out of view, to make the system of doctrine involved in the anathemas, with regard to the one nature of the God-man dominant in the whole Eastern church ; and, like Cyrill, he would very gladly have procured for the Alexandrian church, as a truly aposto-

after the death of Cyrill at Antioch, l. c. Harduin. III. 139, has external evidence for its genuineness still more decided ; being cited already by Marius Mercator. But the internal evidence would seem to be more strong against its authenticity than in the case of the letter we have just considered ; for it exhibits rather the older and sterner form of the Antiochian scheme of doctrine, as it had been first taught by Theodore, than the more moderate shaping of it by Theodoret, especially as it was held by him after the Nestorian controversy. And the exclamations of triumph at the final victory of the pure doctrine, the expressions of joy at the consequent union of the Syrian and Egyptian churches,—*oriens et Ægyptus sub uno iugo est.*—these expressions do not seem in accordance with the prospects which would be anticipated by Theodoret after Cyrill's death, or with the solicitude which he himself evinces in the letter above mentioned. But, on the other hand, it is certainly not at all probable, that one who had before him the history of the next succeeding years would attribute to Theodoret such language as he is here made to use ; and the exaggeration of rhetorical polemics requires many grains of allowance.

* By the complaints of several of his clergy, whom he had persecuted at the council of Chalcedon (see Concil. Chalc. act. III. Harduin. III. f. 322), a very unfavourable light is thrown on the character of Dioscurus, in relation to his avarice, his embezzlement of moneys designed for the churches and for the poor, the persecutions which he practised with the assistance of the most powerful men of the court, as well as in relation to other immoralities. Thus, for example, he is said to have collected together the grain which the emperor was in the habit of sending to the communities of the unfruitful districts of Libya, in times of barrenness, which he sold at a high price, and appropriated the money to his own use. True, we ought not to give too much weight to such accusations against eminent bishops, who had made themselves hateful to a party in these times of violent passions ; but, compared with what we otherwise know for certainty respecting the behaviour of Dioscurus, many of these charges would seem more worthy of credit.

lical one, founded by Mark, the highest authority in the East, and particularly have elevated it above the patriarchate of Constantinople, which was represented to have grown up merely out of secular privileges.* Wanting the cunning of Cyrill, which paid more regard to circumstances, he was the more inclined, where he stood in alliance with the dominant power, to resort to violent and unceremonious modes of proceeding, in which all forms and legal order were utterly disregarded. He needed here, then, for the present, only to go on, according to the system of his predecessor, and to stigmatise all that answered to the more moderate Antiochian system of faith, all that went on the distinction of the two natures in concreto, or which had any bearing on this, as Nestorian heresy. Hence the Syrian churches, in which Theodoret stood particularly prominent on account of his zeal for the defence of this doctrinal system, would be the first object of his attack. And here he found a foothold in a party of clergy, and particularly of monks, who constituted a formidable opposition to the prevailing system in the Syrian system of faith, and who had already stood in intimate connection with Cyrill, and had been used by him as spies and creators of disturbance in the Syrian church. A certain abbot Barsumas stood at the head of this faction.

Next, he had an influential party at Constantinople, composed of those abbots and monks who had already served as the instruments of Cyrill in paving the way for the downfall of Nestorius. They were for the most part men destitute of scientific culture, who, for that very reason, would be most likely to fall in with the formulas of the Alexandrian system, as they proceeded rather from the language of feeling than from that of the understanding; whereas the Antiochian theory of distinction, on the contrary, presupposed an understanding versed in the discrimination of conceptions, and sensible of the need of it; and nothing of that kind was to be found among them. Many of these people perhaps had not even sufficient

* Theodoret says of him, ep. 86 : "Ἀνὰ καὶ κάτω, τοῦ μακαρίου Μάρκου τὸν θρόνον προβάλλεται." He therefore objects to Theodoret, that taking part with a synodal letter sent by the patriarch Proclus from Constantinople, he recognized the primacy of the Constantinopolitan church in the East, and had thus betrayed the privileges alike of the Antiochian as well as of the Alexandrian church.

theological education to be able duly to apprehend the Alexandrian system in its whole coherence and its whole logical evolution; but its main tendency everywhere to give prominence to the ineffable, the inexplicable, the incomprehensible, was also their own; and the forms of expression which were the results of this system coincided also with their favourite expressions. "We hold fast to that which the scriptures declare," so this people were accustomed to talk: "the scriptures declare, 'The Word became flesh.' This means more than that he assumed human nature. In becoming flesh, he assuredly underwent no change. He is the same; but that is the inexpressible wonder; and every human attribute is to be ascribed to this God who became flesh. God was born; God suffered; there is a body of God. The *how* is what no reason can explain. The way in which this took place is known to God alone. We should not desire to know any more than what scripture reveals. All further inquiries and explanations are dangerous to faith." "With God all things are possible: God accomplishes everything according to his own good pleasure, and in a way known to himself alone." Such was the reply, constantly repeated, to all difficulties which might be proposed to them.*

At the head of this party, among the monks of Constantinople, stood the abbot and presbyter Eutyches†—one of those who, for a long series of years, lived shut up in their cloisters, and had but once left them, that they might publicly raise their voice in behalf of the Cyrillian council at Ephesus and against Nestorius. See above.

Under these circumstances the disputes could not fail to break out anew. Those monks at Constantinople had, as we saw already in the case of the Nestorian controversies, great influence with the emperor; they stood closely connected with

* This people's way of thinking and reasoning are graphically described by Theodoret, in the person of Eranistes, particularly in the first of the three dialogues bearing this title; which agrees with the declarations of Eutyches at the council of Constantinople.

† When Eutyches declined to appear personally before the council of Constantinople, under the pretence that for many years he had not been wont to leave his cloister, he was reminded of what he had done during the Nestorian controversies: *Εἰ γὰρ τότε Νεστορίου ἰναντιοῦμενον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας εἰσῆλθες, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὀφείλεις νῦν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ εἰσέλθειν?* Concil. Chalcedonens. Act. I. f. 150. Harduin. Concil. T. II.

those of like disposition among the Syrian monks; and, by the reports which these latter furnished them, their zeal was still more inflamed against the revived Nestorianism. Accordingly, they complained aloud at the renewed error of those who divided the one and only Christ into two Sons of God.*

Though Theodoret loved peace, and did all that lay in his power to preserve a good understanding even with the patriarch Dioscurus,† still his zeal for what he knew to be the truth did not allow him here to be silent; for he saw here the effort to spread abroad doctrines by which the immutability of the divine essence was infringed on, the true humanity of Christ denied, and the doors were thrown wide open for Docetism, Gnosticism, and Apollinarianism, in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. Beyond question it was a rash habit of imputing consequences which led men to imagine that they could find all these heretical tendencies in the rude and exaggerated expressions of these untutored zealots of Constantinople; but there were doubtless good reasons to fear that, if such sensuous forms of expression should once supplant the more accurate dogmatic terminology, those false doctrines and tendencies would easily find in them a point of attachment. And it might actually be the case that many among those people were led by their fears to attribute too much to the human element in the life of Christ, and, from want of mental cultivation, fell into the undeveloped form of doctrine which, before the more accurate determinations had been occasioned by means of Tertullian and Origen, had prevailed in the church. Theodoret, in the year 447, believed himself in duty bound, in a work written on purpose, to controvert the whole Eutychian-Egyptian type of doctrine; and, in opposition to it, to unfold and defend the more mild Antiochian system, according to which the one only Christ consists of two natures ever to be distinguished in respect to their individualities, united with each other in a personal unity without confusion and without transformation.‡ Theodoret

* See, *e.g.*, Theodoret. ep. 82 and ep. 101.

† See his ep. 60 to Dioscurus.

‡ His work entitled *ἱρανιστής* or *πολυμήρφος*, the Beggar or the Multiform; because he accused this new heresy of collecting together by begging so many scraps from divers old erroneous doctrines, that a new one had grown up, which bordered closely on several of the older

showed here that he found no difficulty in transporting himself into the mode of thinking and the point of view of the Eutychian,* whom he introduces speaking under the name of the beggar (ἐραμιστής), and that he understood how to distinguish these views themselves from the consequences flowing from them when consistently carried out. He purposely cited, in this work, against his adversaries, such authorities alone as were recognized by themselves—passages, for instance, from the writings of Cyrill of Alexandria; and he abstained from quoting those church-teachers who were suspected by the opposite party, however much importance he attached to them himself—such, for instance, as Diodorus and Theodore. The moderation which Theodoret here displayed drew upon him, it is true, many reproaches from the zealots of his party; † but by this moderation, however, the entire party of those who were zealous for the doctrine of one nature in Christ could in nowise be conciliated: they saw in this mode of representation, on the contrary, nothing but a revived Nestorianism.

Dioscurus accused Theodoret before the patriarch Domnus of Antioch, that, as had been reported in Egypt, he had, in sermons preached there, taught a doctrine whereby the one Lord Jesus Christ was divided into two Sons of God; and he afterwards published a rude letter to Theodoret himself, in which he accused him of teaching false doctrines. Theodoret

heresies. This work is divided into three dialogues: in the first, hence denominated ὑπερτος, he treats of the immutability of the divine essence; in the second, ἀσυγχύτος, of the distinctness without confusion of the two natures; in the third, ἀπαθής, of the incapability of suffering pertaining to the divine nature.

* We employ this designation here only for the sake of brevity, and to express the thing by a single word, though an honour is thereby ascribed to Eutyches to which he is not entitled; namely, that a new and peculiar doctrinal tendency had proceeded from him as its author.

† See his noble letter to the bishop Irenæus, ep. 16. He says there that the only thing of real importance was to hold fast to those conceptions which are requisite for the unfolding of the truth, and that men ought to avoid terms which excite controversy. He expressed it as his wish, that the whole controversy on the word θεότοκος had never arisen, ὅτι περὶ τούτου πάσα ἡ διαμάχη γιγνέσθαι, ὡς οὐκ ὀφείλιν. His conscience bore him witness, that he had submitted to this accommodation, not for the sake of worldly aggrandisement, not through any desire of the episcopal honour, which had occasioned him so much trouble; but it was his aim neither to say nor to do anything to please this man or that man, but to edify the church of God, and to please its bridegroom and Lord.

replied in a letter to Dioscurus, written with great moderation and forbearance. He begged of him that he would not listen to the representations of one side only, but that he would examine the matter calmly and without prejudice. He endeavoured, by clear and accurate explanations, to ward off the charges with which he had been assailed. He drew up a full confession of faith, in which he adopted the Egyptian forms of expression, qualified by certain precautionary remarks, as closely as he was able, without doing violence to his own doctrinal convictions; and concluded with pronouncing sentence of condemnation on those who refused to call Mary the *θεότοκος*, and on those who called Christ a mere man, or divided the only-begotten into two Sons.* But Dioscurus received Theodoret's overtures of peace in bad temper. He allowed monks to come forth publicly, while he was present in the church, and pronounce the anathema on Theodoret; and he himself sanctioned the act.† He sent deputies to Constantinople with instructions to accuse before the emperor the whole church of Eastern Asia, as being infected with Nestorianism. Hence Domnus was under the necessity of sending a mission to Constantinople for the purpose of defending his church.‡ And Theodoret wrote, in defence of himself, to influential men in church and state at the imperial residence. Now it is true that no new investigation or new decision followed these controversies. But still we see how much could be effected by the influence of Dioscurus; for an imperial decree made its appearance, directing Theodoret, inasmuch as he was constantly assembling synods at Antioch, and disturbing the faith of the orthodox, to keep quiet within the bounds of his own diocese, without stirring beyond its limits or visiting any other city. Very justly might Theodoret complain of this arbitrary and inequitable proceeding, by which, without being allowed the right which even a criminal enjoys, he was condemned unheard. All he asked for was a calm and legal investigation of his case;§ yet this was but a prelude to the more violent outbreak of these disputes in the vicinity of the

* Ep. 83.

† See Theodoret. ep. 86 to Flavian, and ep. 113 to the Roman bishop, Leo the Great. He says in the latter, that this took place a year previous to the second Ephesian church assembly, therefore in the year 448.

‡ See Theodoret, ep. 92.

§ See ep. 79, etc.

court itself. Events here ensued which were at bottom connected with what had transpired in Syria—events which, in the outset, announced an altogether different issue of the Nestorian controversies, and from which the Syrian bishops, who were not sufficiently acquainted with the state of things at the court in Constantinople, were hoping that a favourable turn would be given to their cause,* but which were in fact destined to serve the very end of introducing from a foreign quarter a sudden and violent decision of the contest.

In the first place, an attack coming from another side was made on the man who had hitherto acted as a principal organ of the party of Dioscurus, namely, the abbot Eutyches.†

In the year 448, the bishops from different countries, who happened to be present on various matters of business at Constantinople, met there in an ecclesiastical assembly, under the presidency of the patriarch;‡ when one of their number presented a formal complaint against Eutyches the abbot. The person who in this case appeared as the complainant was the bishop Eusebius, of Doryleum in Phrygia Salutaris, a man who had already, as a layman, in the civil capacity of an imperial commissioner (*agens in rebus*), manifested his zeal for the orthodox faith by intermeddling uncalled for in the Nestorian disputes; and perhaps in this way he may have attained to the episcopal dignity.§ The patriarch Flavian had thus far

* For it is doubtless to the condemnation of Eutyches which followed at Constantinople, that what Theodoret says in ep. 82 refers: *Αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐκ τοῦ οὐράνου δέκυψε, καὶ τῶν τὴν συκοφαντίαν ὑψηλάντων τὴν συκοφαντίαν διηλίχξει, καὶ τὸ δύσσεβες αὐτῶν ἐγυμνώσει φρονήμα.*

† The patriarch Domnus of Antioch is said to have ventured first to accuse this person by name before the emperor, as the reviver of the Apollinarian heresy, who had been bold enough to condemn Theodore and Diodorus. Perhaps this was done in the letter which he wrote to the emperor in vindication of the Oriental church: see above. This accusation by Domnus has been preserved to us by Facundus of Hermonie, in a Latin translation. *Defens. trium capitulor. l. VIII. c. 5.*

‡ *Α συνέδος ἐνδημοῦσα*, as it was called.

§ In the *breviculis historiæ Eutychianistarum*, or the *gestis de nomine Acacii*, belonging to the last years of the fifth century, it is said, for instance, of this Eusebius: *Zelo fidei, quem etiam cum agens in rebus esset, ostendit (ipse enim Nestorium quoque in tempore reprehendit in ecclesia rem sacrilegam prædicantem).* Sirmond. opp. II. Paris. f. 760. These words, by themselves, would render it probable, that the layman who thus interrupted Nestorius in a sermon was no other than this Eusebius; and this conjecture is confirmed by the manner in which Cyrill

taken no part in the disputes between the doctrinal parties; and as he must have been well aware of the great influence possessed by the Eutychian monkish party, as well as of his own critical and hazardous situation with a court party opposed to him, which might easily convert Eutyches into an instrument for promoting their designs, he would be very little incited, under these circumstances, to enlist himself in such controversies. He sought, therefore, in the first place, to crush them in the bud; and sought to induce the bishop Eusebius to give up his suit. He begged of him that he would but make one visit to the abbot Eutyches in his cell, with a purpose of coming to some understanding with him, and settling the terms of peace, so that new disturbances might not arise in the church.* But as Eusebius could not be persuaded to withdraw his complaint, a summons was served upon Eutyches. The latter, in a haughty and imperious manner, at first declined personally to obey the summons. The synod, after the third summons, were about to proceed with him according to the ecclesiastical law, as one who, by refusing to appear, had confessed that he was guilty, when finally he presented himself; not alone, however, but accompanied by a large train of monks, soldiers, and notables of state, who would not part with him till the synod gave their promise

of Alexandria and Marius Mercator express themselves in mentioning the above-related incident, naming him as a person who was *still* among the laity (τέλων μὲν λαϊκοῖς ἐστὶ, qui adhuc inter laicos erat); for this *still* seems to denote that he did not continue to remain a layman, which suits the case of this Eusebius. Nor is Garnier's conjecture improbable, that the same Eusebius was author of the first formal complaint publicly posted up against Nestorius in the church at Constantinople, in which the latter was compared to Paul of Samosata: see above. For it is said, indeed, in the superscription, that it came from the *clergy* of the Constantinopolitan church; but in the complaint itself, one individual only speaks, and he addresses the clergy and laity. Moreover, Leontius of Byzantium says (l. III. c. Nestorianos et Eutychianos) that this document proceeded from a certain Eusebius, qui tunc florebat in judicandi potestate, but who afterwards became bishop of Doryleum. The first remark should be corrected, it is true, by the breviculus; for the *agens* in rebus possessed no judicial powers. Now if this conjecture is correct, Eusebius, while a minister of state, must have already busied himself a good deal with the study of the doctrines of the church, and hence would be the more zealous about them when he became a bishop.

* ἵνα μὴ τίνα ἄλλιν παραχῇν καὶ θόρυβον ἐγγένεσθαι τοῖς Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίαις. See Harduin, T. II. Acta Concil. Chalc. Acta I. f. 111, E.

mistaken and undefined feeling of reverence kept him from this. True, he would have found no difficulty in expressing himself precisely as the synod required that he should, although he had hitherto never expressed himself thus; but yet he would not consent to condemn the opposite form of expression, which in truth appeared to him the better one. Since, then, he could not make up his mind to recognize the two natures in Christ, nor to join in the above-mentioned formula of condemnation, the synod gave sentence against him that he should be divested of all his spiritual titles, and excommunicated from the church.

Flavian—who, as we have already said, had from the very first engaged, not without solicitude, in this whole affair—must have been well aware of the danger into which he was plunging, by proceeding thus against the head of a monkish party possessed of so much influence at court, and connected with the powerful patriarch of Alexandria. Even as the leader of that monkish clan which had proved to be so influential amidst the Nestorian controversies, Eutyches was a dangerous man.* But, besides this, the case now was, that the most powerful men of the court, the eunuch, and chief lord of the bedchamber, Chrysaphius, whose influence was then unbounded, and Nomus, the most eminent of the officers of state, maintained a close correspondence with the patriarch Dioscurus, and consented to assist in the promotion of his ends; and that Chrysaphius was a personal friend of Eutyches, whom he respected as his godfather,† and hostile to the patriarch Flavian, with whom his avarice found it more difficult to drive a profitable bargain than with a Dioscurus.‡ Chrysa-

* See the complaint of an Alexandrian presbyter against Dioscurus, in Harduin Concil. T. II. f. 332. Of Nomus it is here said: *Τότε τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν χερίσιν ἔχοντι πράγματα*. Theodoret also had proofs of the unfavourable disposition of the patrician Nomus towards his party, as two letters which he sent him were not answered. See ep. 26.

Eusebius of Doryleum shows, by a remarkable expression of his during the proceedings at Constantinople, how much reason he had to fear the power of Eutyches. "I fear his running about," says he; "I am poor, he has money; he threatens me with exile, he already depicts to me the Oasis." *Δεδόκα αὐτοῦ τὴν περιδρόμην, ἔγω πένης εἰμί, ἔξοριαν μοι ἀπειλεῖ χρημάτων ἔχει· ἀναζωγράφει μοι ἥδη τὴν "Οάσιν*. See acta Concil. Chalc. Harduin. T. II. f. 162, E.

† See Liberat. breviar. c. xi.

‡ See Theophan. Chronograph. ed. Venet. f. 68. Chrysaphius, according to this historian, had invited the emperor to require of the patriarch

phius was at the head of a court-party opposed to the influence of Pulcheria, the emperor's sister; and the latter was a patroness of Flavian. Chrysaphius, having succeeded then in forming a league with the empress Eudocia against Pulcheria, and in depriving the latter of her influence, and finally removing her entirely from the court, was now armed with all necessary power to proceed against the patriarch. It might well be, therefore, that the whole contest, if not instigated by his own secret arts and those of Dioscurus, yet furnished him with a welcome occasion for prosecuting a plan which had been devised before.

The way in which Eutyches presented himself before the assembly plainly showed that he was conscious of being able to depend on the assistance of a powerful party. Thus it became known, even in distant lands, how much Flavian had hazarded by this mode of proceeding. The advocates of the doctrine of the two natures in Syria saw in this case a triumph of the truth, which they attributed to the zeal and courage of Flavian overcoming the fear of human power; and they sent messages to assure him of their sympathy and joy on the occasion.*

But Eutyches applied to the emperor with a petition, demanding a new trial. He endeavoured to show that, in the proceedings against him, the prescribed legal forms had been violated; that the sentence of condemnation had been already prepared before he was tried; and that, in the drawing up of the protocol, many things had been stated that were untrue. The emperor received the petition, and ordered a revision of the earlier proceedings. But as Flavian, with all his respect for the emperor, yet did not suffer himself to be influenced in the least in his judicial proceedings by fear of the imperial power, the revision resulted in a confirmation of the sentence pronounced upon Eutyches.

Flavian a present in gold (*εὐλογία*) on the occasion of his entering into his office. Flavian sent him an episcopal gift, consecrated bread, (*εὐλογία* in another sense,) with which, however, Chrysaphius was not satisfied. As it is intimated in Theophanes (l. c.) that Flavian took the part of certain Alexandrian clergy, Cyrill's relations, persecuted by Dioscurus, in opposition to Chrysaphius, who here acted in subserviency to the revengeful spirit of Dioscurus, while he sought at the same time to gratify his own avarice, (see Harduin. l. c.) we may perhaps find in this also a reason for the hatred of both these men to Flavian.

* Theodoret. ep. 11.

This was, however, by no means the end of the business : it was rather but the beginning of greater and more general commotions in the Eastern church. Eutyches had already, during the proceedings at Constantinople, let fall an expression, from which his ulterior designs might have been conjectured. He had said he would consent to profess his belief in the two natures of Christ, if the bishops of Alexandria and of Rome would also approve of it. The sentiments of his ally Dioscurus were well known to him ; and he expected to be upheld by the Roman bishop, judging from the manner in which the predecessors of that bishop had espoused the cause of the monkish party in the contest with Nestorius. But he did not consider that the doctrines of Nestorius might be opposed from some other point of view than that of the Monophysites. Eutyches himself wished to have that expression considered as an appeal to a general council to be attended by both the other patriarchs. This appeal to another council was thenceforward the mark at which he constantly aimed. Of this he spoke in his letter to the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, complaining that Nestorianism was starting up afresh. Of this he treated also in his conferences with the emperor ; and the emperor, already reminded from those at Alexandria that new and energetic measures were required in order to supplant the reviving Nestorianism, was therefore easily induced to comply with Eutyches' request. Already, when the revision of this matter at Constantinople was ordered by the emperor, arrangements were at the same time in progress for assembling a general council, which should pass definitive sentence on all the matters in dispute.*

Flavian, however, was desirous of preventing the convocation of a new council of this sort. In his view, no such assembly was needed, since the doctrine of the church, as hitherto expressed, was sufficiently decided against Eutyches. This, we must allow, was not necessarily clear to all ; for nothing, at least in the public declarations of the church, had been expressly determined on the points in dispute ; as the

* The remark of a bishop, from which we may see that all this was only intended as a provisory transaction: *Εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα οἰκουμένῃν ἐκκλησίᾳ γίνεσθαι σύνοδος καὶ τιφυλάκται τὰ καιριώτερα τῶν πραγμάτων ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ συνόδῳ καὶ μετασταλέσαν πολλοί.* Conc. Chal. Harduin. T. II. f. 176, D.

antagonism between the doctrines of the Antiochian and the Alexandrian church had not as yet been resolved by any public decisions; and the articles of agreement entered into with Cyrill, which might pass for such conciliation, had from the first been differently construed by the different parties. Beyond question, in the existing state of feeling of which we have spoken above, and with the known disposition of Dioscurus, and the mighty influence of his party, which was also the party of Eutyches, no good could be expected from a new general synod. Hence Flavian called upon the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, to use his authority also to prevent the assembling of another general council, lest all the churches should be thrown into disturbance.* These words show what prospects were anticipated from the council in question; and similar were the expectations of all unprejudiced men who were honestly solicitous for the welfare of the church.

But Flavian could not obtain what he desired. The emperor could not forgive him for condemning Eutyches, which from the first was contrary to his will; and for this very reason he became more closely connected with the opposite party, under whose supremacy the general council was to be placed.

The manner in which this new council, the second general council of Ephesus, appointed to meet at Ephesus in the year 449, was first announced by the emperor, and the arrangement of its course of proceedings, could but serve to deepen the solicitude which had been awakened at the outset; since it was plainly manifest that the emperor had a perfect understanding with Dioscurus, and that the assembly was to be used by the latter and his party only as an instrument for the accomplishment of a plan which had already been prepared. In his ordinance, addressed to this synod, the emperor declared that, as the patriarch Flavian had stirred up a dispute concerning the doctrines of faith with the abbot Eutyches, he, the emperor, had taken great pains to suppress the disorders which had arisen, and for this reason had often sent to the patriarch; for, in his opinion, the true faith had been sufficiently established by what had been taught by the fathers at Nice and at Ephesus. But as the patriarch was not to be moved by his repeated entreaties that he would abstain from

* "Ὅτις μὴ τὰς ἀπαντάχους ἐκκλησίας διαταράχῃται."

these disputes, therefore the emperor had not deemed it safe to let such a controversy be managed without calling in the assistance of all the most eminent bishops from all countries; and hence this general council had been convoked for the purpose of investigating the whole matter anew, and of extirpating every devilish root;* for the purpose of thrusting the adherents of the blasphemies of the godless Nestorius out of the church, and of ordering that the orthodox doctrine should be maintained with unshaken constancy. Dioscurus was nominated by the emperor president of the council; and his assessors were to be the bishops Juvenalis of Jerusalem and Thalassius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia. The last, however, were mentioned in such a way as made it sufficiently evident that they were to be used only as the tools of Dioscurus; for it was said of both those bishops that they, and all such warm friends of orthodoxy, would be of the same mind with Dioscurus. The judges of Eutyches—for example, the patriarch Flavian—should attend the council, not as judges, however, nor as voters, but in order to learn the decision of the council, which was to investigate the matter anew. Already, in the first letters missive, the emperor had ordered that Theodoret should be present only on condition it should be deemed good by the whole assembly; but, in case of any difference of opinion on this point, he should remain excluded. By this it was very clearly announced beforehand, that Theodoret was not to be admitted. Yet too many apprehensions were still entertained of the influence of the well-merited esteem in which that excellent man stood with many. For this reason, in his letter to Dioscurus, the emperor declared why he had nominated him to be president of the assembly, “Because it might happen that numbers inclined to Nestorianism would take every pains to bring it about, in some way or other, that Theodoret should attend the council. On this account Dioscurus only should decide that point; for those who ventured to add or take away anything from the doctrines of faith, as they had been established at Nice, and afterwards at Ephesus, ought to have no voice at the synod, but, on the contrary, to be subjected to its judicial sentence.”

* Πάσαν διαβολικὴν ἔκκοψαι ῥίζαν, *i. e.*, as is, in fact, immediately afterwards explained, the devilish heresy of Nestorius.

While all the opponents of the Alexandrian system of faith were thus plainly enough excluded from the synod as Nestorians, the other party, on the contrary, were favoured in the most arbitrary manner. The emperor directed, "Because, in many districts of the East, the orthodox Archimandrites* were in controversy with the bishops, who were said to be infected with the Nestorian blasphemy, therefore, the abbot Barsumas, as their representative, should have a seat and a voice at the council." The emperor had appointed two civil officers,—men, as he declared, of approved orthodoxy,—to attend the proceedings as his plenipotentiaries. In the instructions given to them, they were directed, in case they observed any one creating disturbance to the prejudice of the holy faith, to place such person in safe custody, and report the fact to the emperor; that is, they were authorized to remove every man who was bold enough to express freely his own convictions in opposition to the Alexandrian monophysitism.

In correspondence with these arrangements was the actual course of this council, justly branded in the history of the church with the title *robber-synod* (σύνδος ληστρική). Dioscurus here ruled supreme, by his vote, which was paramount to every other; by the influence of the imperial commissioners, which gave meaning and force to his threats; by the fanatical violence of his Egyptian party, and particularly of the great body of monks who attended Barsumas, whose fierce shouts might well give reason to apprehend that they were capable of any outrage; by a troop of brawny hospital waiters (parabolani), and soldiers, who were admitted into the assembly for the purpose of intimidating refractory members seated before them;† and finally, through the cowardice or entire want of character shown by so many bishops, to whom the truth was not the highest of all interests. Nothing could be more con-

* The very party with which, as we have before remarked, Theodoret and his friends had so many contests.

† The bishop Basil of Seleucia, in Isauria, said to Dioscurus, at the council of Chalcedon, in excuse of what he had done contrary to his own convictions, at the council of Ephesus: Πολλὴν ἐπιστήσας ἡμῖν τότε ἀνάγκην τὴν μὲν ἰξάσθαι, τὴν δὲ ἔνδοθεν, τὴν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς γλώσσης σου εἰσπρέχον γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν στρατιώται μετὰ ὅπλων καὶ εἰσηκέισαν οἱ μονάζοντες μετὰ Βαρσούμα καὶ οἱ παραβαλάνεις καὶ πλῆθος ἄλλο πολὺ. Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 213, l. c.

trary to the spirit of the gospel than the fanaticism which actuated the dominant party in this council in favour of certain dogmatic formulas of conception, in which men dreamed of possessing Christ, who is spirit and life, though in temp^r and action they denied him. Theodoret relates* that, when the assembly were about to bring a formal complaint against a bishop who was accused of unchastity and various other crimes, the president Dioscurus dismissed the whole matter, remarking: "If you have a complaint against his orthodoxy, we shall receive it; but we have not come here to pass judgment on unchastity." Theodoret takes this occasion to set forth the character of the synod. "They were for acting," he said, "as if Christ had merely prescribed a rule of faith, without giving rules of practice." Some examples from the proceedings may serve to verify this description.

The general plan which Dioscurus pursued at this council was the same which he had thus far been prosecuting by his subservient instruments—to condemn whatever was opposed to the Alexandrian system of doctrine, as a heretical innovation over-stepping the determinations of doctrine settled at the councils of Nice and of Ephesus. He opened the proceedings by declaring that the council of Nice and the council of Ephesus had both established the same creed; everything had on these occasions been settled in an unalterable manner. Accursed be he who would unsettle again, and subject to new examination, what had there been determined! This proposition was received with shouts of approbation like the following: "On this depends the salvation of the world! God save the bishop Dioscurus, the great guardian of the faith!" He then cited the passage in 1 Sam. ii. 25, from which the misapprehended distinction had been drawn between sins against God and sins against man, and the perverted principle that heresies were sins of far deeper dye than all others. And he added, applying this principle to the present case: "If the Holy Ghost then dwelt with our fathers, and determined whatever was determined, then he who has introduced any alterations here has proved himself to be a despiser of the divine grace." This also was received "as the voice of the Holy Spirit," as the synod expressed it in their shout of applause. The very announcement of the proposition, that Christ consists of two

* Ep. 147 ad Joannem Germaniciæ.

natures, produced such an excitement that all the Egyptian bishops, and the whole throng of monks that accompanied Barsumas, exclaimed, "Divide asunder the man himself who speaks of two natures. He who speaks of two natures is a *Nestorius*." When the bishop Eusebius of Doryleum attempted to explain the doctrine of two natures in Christ, many voices exclaimed, "Burn Eusebius; let him be burnt alive. As he has cut asunder Christ, so let *him* be cut asunder."* Such exclamations, with the sight of the soldiers and the ferocious monks, were quite sufficient to stupify many who otherwise would not have given their assent to the propositions of Dioscurus. Thrown off from their self possession, and hurried along against their will, they repeated by rote whatever was prescribed to them.†

True, the bishops who attended this Ephesian synod had strong inducements afterwards, at the council of Chalcedon, to exaggerate the scenes of violence which there occurred, in palliation of their own conduct on that occasion; and, besides, many contradictions may be detected in their remarks; but still it is clear that force was resorted to in various ways to compel men to subscribe the decisions of the council; that the bishops were kept confined for a whole day in the church; that they were menaced by soldiers and monks till they had subscribed; and that *blank papers* were laid before them for their signature, which could afterwards be filled up with whatever the leaders chose.‡

After Dioscurus had thus carried through the principle that the Nicene-Ephesian creed was alone valid, the canon established at the first council of Ephesus was now confirmed anew, that whoever taught or endeavoured to introduce anything different from these articles, should, if a bishop or ecclesiastic, be deposed from his spiritual office; and, if a layman, excommunicated from the church. This law was next applied in a wholly arbitrary manner, and without any trial of the cases, to the bishops Flavian and Eusebius. Inasmuch as these bishops

* Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 162, E.

† A bishop, Basil of Seleucia, says himself afterwards, at the council of Chalcedon, in his own excuse: Τοσούτος ἐγένετο χρότος, ὥστε πάντων ἡμῶν σιναχθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν . . . ἀχλύς δὲ πληρώβεις εἶπον. F. 102.

‡ F. 94. Theodoret also says, soon after these events: Τῶν συνεληλυθόντων οἱ πλείστοι βιασθέντες συνέθεντο. Ep. 142.

had deviated on almost every point from this creed, and thus excited disturbances and scandal in all countries, they had of themselves incurred those established and unalterable penalties, and should be deposed from their spiritual office.* Many who were impelled by their fears to acquiesce in these judgments, quieted their consciences with the reflection that at least no new doctrines had been proposed, to which they were forced to give their assent; for the only point in question was whether they should hold fast the form of doctrine set forth in the Nicene and Ephesian councils. But they would not distinctly look at the fact that Flavian and Eusebius were at any rate deposed solely on grounds of doctrine.† Accordingly, those very bishops who had taken part in the council of Constantinople under Flavian gave their assent to these decrees. Even the patriarch Domnus, of Antioch, who, on account of the position which he held in the church, stood at the head of the Orientals, was persuaded to yield with the rest, heedless of the warnings which the excellent Theodoret, with a wise foresight of the future, gave him when the council was about to be opened.‡ But this compliance could not avail him. Dioscurus could not for this forgive him his opposition to the Cyrillian anathemas; and, being compelled by sickness to withdraw from the council, sentence of deposition was pronounced afterwards also

* When that canon was brought forward by Dioscurus, several bishops remarked at once, that the deposition of Flavian was the real object at bottom. And when, soon after, Dioscurus actually proposed this deposition, many of the bishops arose, and clasping his knees, begged him to desist from that judgment. One of the bishops alleged the very characteristic reason, that he too had presbyters, and should therefore be cautious how he let a bishop be deposed for the sake of a presbyter. But Dioscurus remained firm; he would rather let his tongue be cut out, he said, than pass any other sentence, and he threatened to call upon the imperial commissioners. Dioscurus asserted, it is true, that this whole account of the matter, given by some bishops at the council of Chalcedon, was false, and appealed to witnesses. But he may have easily forgotten himself what he had said in the heat of passion; and as a matter of course, such things were not entered on the minutes of the scribes. A great deal in those remarks bears at least an impress too distinctly characteristic to be liable to the suspicion of having been invented. Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 215.

† Μηδεμίαν γενεήσθαι περί τὸ δόγμα κανωτομίαν. Ep. 147.

‡ See Theodoret, ep. 112. Theodoret here very justly reminds the patriarch, that no good had come of all the previous councils.

upon him.* The same sentence was passed upon Theodoret, and several others who were among the most worthy bishops of the East.

By an imperial edict, Theodoret was also removed from his diocese, and obliged to retire to the cloister where he had received his early education. His enemies endeavoured so to contrive it that he should be deprived even of the necessaries of life; and many were so awed by the power of the dominant party that they dared not interfere in his behalf.† There were, however, a few pious bishops who vied with each other in testifying their affection for a man who was thus suffering for the truth. Theodoret, who was accustomed to moderate his bodily wants, and needed but very little to satisfy them, declined most of the gifts which were offered him, writing to his friends —“that the God who gave the very ravens their abundance of food, had provided him thus far with all that was needful for his support.”‡ When we compare the spirit of ambition and violence on the one hand, and of servile compliance and cowardice on the other, exhibited by so many bishops of the East, with the firmness rising above all fear of man, the tranquil composure amid all the storms of the times, and the confidence of faith in contending for the truth, which shine forth in this example of Theodoret, the striking contrast leaves upon us but a still more agreeable impression of his character.§

* See Liberatus, cap. 12. Dioscurus brought in evidence against him a letter in which he had declared against the anathemas, though certainly in very moderate terms (*eo quod essent obscura*).

† He writes himself, ep. 134: *Εἰ πάντες ταύτην ἐξηλώσαν τὴν ἀμνηστία, οὐδὲν ἑτέρον ὑπελείπεται, ἢ ζώντας μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐνορίας ἀναλωθῆναι, τελευτήσαντες δὲ μὴ τὰ φῶς παραδοῆναι, ἀλλὰ κύνων καὶ θήρων γένεσθαι βόραν.*

‡ Ep. 123.

§ A few characteristic facts selected from his letters may here serve as illustrations. When he first received the tidings of his deposition, he wrote: (ep. 21 :) “All the sufferings we meet for the sake of the divine doctrines are very welcome to us. It cannot be otherwise, if we truly believe in the promises of our Lord, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. Rom. viii. 18. But why do I mention the enjoyment of future blessings? For even though no reward were bestowed on the combatants, yet the truth, itself alone, were enough to move its friends to encounter with all joy every danger in its behalf.” He then proceeds to unfold in a beautiful manner, from the epistles of Paul, from the passage in Rom. viii. 35—38, how the apostle asked for no recompense, but the love of the Saviour was to him more than all recompense;—the doctrine,

Thus, then, the party of Dioscurus, by availing itself of the power of the court, had succeeded in crushing the Oriental church. Some changed their faith with the change of circumstances, and bowed the knee to the dominant party.* Others, although they remained faithful to the truth themselves, yet dared not lift up their voice in its defence. The men of free and fearless spirit were separated from their churches and banished. In this lamentable state of things, but one refuge was left to the oppressed church of the East, namely, to appeal for redress to the western church, which had remained free from the influence of the political power, and had not been affected by any of these contests; and especially to the bishop of the ancient capital of the world, through whose all-powerful influence at the court of the Roman emperor, they might hope to receive assistance also from the latter quarter.

This important station in the church was then occupied by Leo the Great, a person of great energy and firmness of character. Leo had from the first been drawn into some participation in these controversies. Eutyches, in the first place, and then Flavian, had had recourse to him. As soon as he obtained exact information respecting the subject of the dispute with Eutyches, he acquiesced in the sentence of condemnation passed on his doctrine, and simply expressed a wish that gentle methods might be employed to induce Eutyches to recant, and, if he could not be persuaded, that he might be forgiven. He afterwards wrote Flavian a letter constituting an epoch in the history of the doctrines of faith, in which he endeavoured to prescribe the law for the decision of those

pre-eminently shining through the writings of the Antiochian church-teachers, of disinterested love: Those who counselled him to be silent, and yield to the times,—a so-called *οικονομία*,—he repelled, opposing to them the precepts of holy writ, which require the bold annunciation of the truth; and he reminds them of that truth worthy of all acceptance, that none of the other cardinal virtues can avail anything without fortitude, ep. 122. In predicting the judgment of God which awaited the authors of injustice, he only expressed the wish, that they might seasonably desist from their wrong-doing, “that we may not be compelled to sorrow over them when we see them suffering punishment.” Ep. 124. “What can be more feeble than they are who lack the truth?” he writes, ep. 129.

* Of such Theodoret says, ep. 147: Ποίοι πολύποδες οὕτως πρὸς τὰς πίττας τὴν οἰκίαν ἱναλλάττουσι χρέαν ἢ χαμαιλίοντες πρὸς τὰ φύλλα τὸ ῥήμα, ὥς οὗτοι τὴν γνώμην πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς μεταβάλλουσιν.

disputes, and unfolded in detail the doctrine of the unity of Christ, as one person in two natures, both retaining unaltered their respective attributes, but acting in union with each other; and to this letter he constantly refers in all his succeeding communications. The emperor Theodosius having invited him to take a part in the Ephesian council, he sent, as his deputies, the bishop Julius of Puteoli, the presbyter Renatus, the deacon Hilarus, and the notary Dulcitus. These deputies witnessed the scenes of violence which were exhibited at that synod; but they played there a very insignificant part, having attempted in vain to get permission even to do so much as to read publicly before the synod the letter of Leo. Without directly giving them a refusal, the all-controlling Dioscurus still contrived always to find some plausible reason for delay.* When the patriarch Flavian protested against the unrighteous judgment passed by the Ephesian council, the Roman deacon had courage enough to join in this protest;† and Flavian handed

* Dioscurus at first had even proposed that the letter should be read before the synod, though perhaps he was not in earnest about it. But upon this, the first secretary of the Alexandrian church (Primericius notariorum), the presbyter John, whose duty it was to present the official records, said that he held in his hands the imperial *sacra* addressed to the council. Respect to the emperor now required that this document should be read first, and the letter of Leo was then forgotten. See Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 90. When it was proposed afterwards, that the acts of the *σύνδος ἐνδημούσα*, by which Eutyches was condemned, should be read, and the Roman deputies were asked whether they also were satisfied with this course, they declared they would agree to it on condition that Leo's letter to Flavian should first be read. But now Eutyches declared the Roman deputies were suspected by him, for on their arrival they had alighted at the house of the patriarch Flavian, they had breakfasted with him, had frequently been in conference with him, and Flavian had shown them all possible honour. He must, therefore, require, that, if they proposed doing him any wrong, this should not be used to his disadvantage. The bishop Dioscurus then declared, it was certainly no more than right that those acts should first be read, and then the reading of the letter might follow afterwards. But when this was done, no one remembered that Leo's letter was next to be read. Act. Chalc. I. f. 110. For a third time the Roman deacon, Hilarus, took the opportunity, when Dioscurus brought forward his proposition respecting the unalterable validity of the Nicene-Ephesian articles of faith, to affirm that these doctrines agreed with the faith of the fathers, as also with that letter of Leo; and added, that if they would allow that letter to be read, they would perceive that it contained nothing but the truth. But again this invitation was neglected. L. c. f. 255, E. † L. c. f. 258.

over to him an appeal to a larger council which should be held in Italy. Hilarus succeeded in escaping from the high-handed violence of Dioscurus; and, by choosing the less frequented routes, arrived at Rome, where he drew up a faithful description to his bishop of the proceedings of the Ephesian council, and presented to him the appeal.* The bishop Theodoret also, in a remarkable letter,† resorted to an appeal of the same kind.

Many and various were the motives which now conspired to determine Leo as to the course he should pursue, and as to the way in which he should embark in these affairs. On the one hand, the zeal for pure doctrine, sympathy for oppressed innocence, indignation at the unspiritual mode of proceeding at Ephesus,—on the other hand, the idea which already completely absorbed his mind, that a certain superintendence and jurisdiction over the whole church belonged to him as the successor of Peter,—all these considerations combined to give a certain direction to his mode of conduct. No sooner had he received these accounts from his deacon, than, in his letter addressed to the East, he expressed in the most emphatic tone his dissatisfaction at the arbitrary behaviour of the Ephesian council,‡ and urged the necessity of assembling a new council in Italy. Through the influence of Leo, a letter written in the same spirit was addressed from the court of the Western emperor to Constantinople. By all these means, nothing, however, could for the present be effected. So false a representation of all that had happened had been given to the emperor Theodosius, who, at the same time, depended entirely upon it; so completely concealed from him was the true condition of the Eastern church, that he wrote to the emperor Valentinian III. everything had been transacted at Ephesus with perfect freedom, and in strict conformity to truth; none but the unworthy bishops had been deposed; Flavian had met with the punishment he deserved; and, since his deposition, perfect peace and unanimity prevailed in the churches, where nothing else was now supreme but the pure truth.

* L. c. f. 34.

† See above, vol. III. p. 245, in the history of the church constitution.

‡ With him originated the name by which this council was stigmatized in the history of the church. *Ephesinum non judicium; sed latrocinium*, ep. 95, ed. Ballerin, according to other editions, ep. 75.

Meanwhile, however, the choice of Anatolius as the new patriarch of Constantinople, in place of the deposed Flavian, rendered it necessary to enter into new negotiations with the Roman bishop; for it was wished that he should be recognized also in the Western church, which could not be done without the concurrence of the Roman bishop. But Leo would not otherwise consent to recognize Anatolius, except on condition he gave unambiguous proofs of his orthodoxy; condemned the doctrines of Eutyches as well as of Nestorius, and consented to subscribe, with several other documents, the letter of Leo to Flavian.* To settle the details of the business with the patriarch, he moreover sent to Constantinople a delegation consisting of two bishops. One of whom was Abundius, bishop of Como, and two presbyters.

In the meantime, important changes had occurred at Constantinople in the state of public affairs, altogether favourable to Leo's designs. Dioscurus had in truth been indebted, in a great measure, for his triumph, to the power of Chrysaphius and of the empress Eudocia; but now Chrysaphius had fallen into disgrace, and was banished. The emperor had separated from his wife Eudocia, and the latter retired to the district of Jerusalem. Pulcheria, the patroness of Flavian, was recalled to court, and once more obtained unbounded influence.† These changes alone enabled Leo now to accomplish vastly more at Constantinople. Already had Pulcheria caused Flavian's body to be brought to Constantinople, and buried with all the honours due to a patriarch. In addition to this, an event now occurred which gave the decisive blow. Theodosius died in the year 450, when Pulcheria united herself in marriage with Marcian, and procured for him the imperial dignity. The prevailing religion at court now took an altogether different turn. The bishops who had been deposed and exiled on account of their faith were recalled, and directed to resume their dioceses. As the prevailing doctrinal inclination of the court was wont to have great influence on the conduct of very many bishops, so it happened too in the present case. Many, who under the former reign had taken the side of Dioscurus,

* See Leo's letter to the emperor Theodosius, to Pulcheria, and to the abbots of Constantinople, ep. 63-71, and the life of the bishop Abundius of Como, in the *actis Sanctorum*, II. April.

† See Theophanes chronograph.

under the influence of force or of fear, or who were already in the habit of making their doctrinal opinions subservient to circumstances, now signified their repentance. The patriarch Anatolius transacted all matters relating to the healing of the schism of the churches, in a common understanding with the Roman bishop Leo; and, to facilitate this, the latter sent a new deputation to Constantinople. He declared it to be his own mind, that the bishops who had erred simply through weakness or fear, should be granted forgiveness, if they signified their repentance, and, as he had already required of Anatolius, should present satisfactory testimonies of their orthodoxy. An exception only should be made of the case of those bishops who had taken the lead in the second Ephesian council, Dioscurus and Juvenalis of Jerusalem. The definitive sentence with regard to these last should remain reserved to the Roman bishop until after a more exact investigation.

At the same time, however, the objects and interests of the Roman bishop and of the imperial court could not be brought perfectly to agree with each other. Leo proceeded on the supposition that a new investigation of the doctrines of faith was wholly unnecessary, since everything had been sufficiently decided already by what had been determined during the previous disputes, and especially by his own letter to Flavian; and that the only proper subject for deliberation and counsel was, how to proceed with those who had lately espoused the party of the second Ephesian synod. Should it be thought advisable on this account to assemble a general council, this ought to be appointed to meet in some Italian city; Flavian having in fact appealed to a council to be convened in Italy.* But the emperor had in view at the same time with the doctrinal interest, also a political one: he did not wish to suppress by force a schism which was so deeply rooted and so widely spread, and the suppression of which might be attended with such disastrous consequences both to church and state; but he wished to devise means for a peaceable settlement. It was his desire, therefore, to avoid offending either of the two contending parties, and especially did he need to be indulgent

* *É. g. ep. 82 ad Marcian. Non cujusmodi sit fides tenenda tractandum est; sed quorum precibus et qualiter annuendum. Ep. 94 ad eundem. Quamvis synodum fieri intra Italiam proposuisssem, — which he often repeated in his letters to Constantinople.*

towards a sect so powerful in one part of the empire, and so dangerous on account of their wild fanaticism, as was the monophysite or Egyptian party. Hence the object to be accomplished could not appear so easy to the emperor as it did to the Roman bishop, neither could he agree with the latter in respect to the choice of means. He wished and hoped—a hope which no one but a layman ignorant of the common course of theological controversies could entertain—to bring about, by means of negotiations at a general council, a concordat, which might serve as the basis of a reconciliation between the two parties. But this object was one which he could hope to accomplish only by means of a council, whose place of assembling should be so near that an influence might be brought to bear upon its proceedings from Constantinople; and that, if necessary, the emperor might attend it himself. He therefore sent out his letters missive for such a council to meet at Nice, in Bithynia, in the year 451. This particular town was doubtless selected for the express purpose of giving greater authority to the council by the remembrance of the first council of Nice, whose creed it was once more to assert in opposition to strange doctrines of erroneous tendency. Moreover, the bishop of Rome was invited to take a share in the deliberations of this council.

During these transactions Leo proceeded according to the same consistent principles and in the same spirit as he had ever maintained. The position which he assumed for himself was that of a certain primacy, a certain supreme jurisdiction, which it belonged to him to assert over the whole church. He alleged as the reason why he could not himself appear at that council, not only the then political situation of the Western empire, but also the ancient usage, which did not permit a Roman bishop to be personally present at a foreign general council,* as if this was beneath the dignity of a bishop of Rome; and yet he deemed himself warranted to exercise the presidency there through his delegates, three bishops and two presbyters, whom he sent to Chalcedon;† and in fact they

* See ep. 93 to the synod at Nice: *Nec ulla poterat consuetudo permittere.* So, too, the deputies of Leo, in the beginning of the third act of the council, ἐπειδήπερ οὕτω τὸ τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς ἑξὺς ἐσχέκει τούτο.

† Ep. 93 to the synod at Nice: *In his fratribus, qui ab apostolica directi sunt, me synodo vestra fraternitas æstimet presidere.*

often conducted the council in such a manner, as that they seemed to arrogate to themselves in the name of the Roman bishop a certain supreme judicial authority :* although at the same time the patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople considered himself the president of the synod.†

The church assembly was now about to be opened at Nice, where 630 bishops had already convened ; but the disturbances excited there by fanatical ecclesiastics, monks, and laymen, probably belonging to the party of Dioscurus, and who threatened to repeat over the scenes of the second Ephesian council, doubtless convinced the emperor that it would be necessary to bring the place for the assembling of the council nearer to the imperial residence, and more under the influence of the government. The Roman delegates also informed the emperor, that they dared not attend the council unless he himself would be present. In order, therefore, to the better guidance of the council, the emperor transferred it from Nice to Chalcedon.‡ Thus, by its vicinity to the seat of government, the object could now be secured which was originally had in view, that the first officers of state and the imperial senate might be present at the meetings ; and that, whenever aught occurred of doubtful character, the emperor might be immediately informed of it, and interpose his veto.

The imperial court had set itself a problem, the solution of which was attended with the utmost difficulty—to reconcile and unite together two parties irritated and inflamed with fanatical hatred towards each other. This was apparent at the very outset, in the manner in which Theodoret was received by the two parties, when he appeared in the midst of

* So, *e. g.*, the Roman delegate, in the third act, said the apostolic see had granted pardon to the penitent bishops of the second Ephesian council, l. c. 346. When Dioscurus was about to take his seat in the synod, the Roman delegates declared they had been instructed by the bishop of the city of Rome, which is the head of all the churches, κεφαλῆς ὑπάρχοντος πάσων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, not to suffer this ; for he had presumed to hold a synod without the assistance of the apostolic seat, a thing which never had been done, and which ought not to be done. They declared that they were resolved to take their leave if this was permitted. Concil. Chalc. act. I. f. 68.

† Leo and Anatolius are named together as ἐξαρχόντες τῆς συνόδου. Act. IV. f. 436.

‡ See the letter of Marcian to the synod at Nice, f. 48 and 49, l. c., and Liberatus, c. 13.

the council as the accuser of his former judges, and to obtain a solemn act of justification. While he was welcomed by the Orientals with expressions of enthusiastic sympathy, the bishops of the Egyptian party degraded their spiritual character by repeated outcries of blind and frantic fanaticism:—"Cast forth the Jew, the enemy of God, the blasphemer of Christ!"—and to remind the empress, that she who had wrought the overthrow of Nestorianism ought not to tolerate this Nestorian, they added, "Long live the empress! Long live the orthodox emperor!" so that the very laymen of rank, who attended the synod in the name of the emperor, were constrained to say that such vulgar outcries ill beseemed bishops, and could be of no advantage to any party. But the bishops justified themselves on the ground "that they were lifting up their voice in defence of piety and the orthodox faith."*

True, the influence of the altered tone of the court soon manifested itself in the case of those bishops who had attached themselves to Dioscurus at the Ephesian council, even such of them as had stood with him at the head of the synod. Already, during the first proceedings, the majority went over from the right side, where the Egyptian party sat, to the left, where the Orientals were seated under the presidency of the Roman delegates.† Often, especially when the question related to the deposing of all those bishops who had stood foremost in the second Ephesian council, the council resounded with the cry, "We have all sinned, we all ask forgiveness." Many with very ill grace excused the part they had taken at that former council, by pleading the command of imperial authority, and the constraint to which they were put; whereupon the lay dignitaries must reply, that in matters of faith such an excuse could not pass;‡ and Dioscurus was doubtless right in saying, that such an excuse implied in its very terms an accusation.§

* *Δι' εὐσεβείαν πράξομεν.* act. I. l. c. f. 74.

† Concil. Chalce. act. I. f. 130.

‡ Concil. Chalce. act. I. f. 106.

§ The bishop Basil of Seleucia in Isauria excused his signature to the judgment pronounced on the patriarch Flavian, on the plea that deference to a tribunal composed of a hundred and twenty or thirty bishops compelled him to obey their decrees. When, upon this, Dioscurus remarked that he had passed judgment on himself of having trampled on right through the fear of man, he gave this singular reply: If he had stood before secular magistrates he would have been ready to die as a martyr; but he had no power to contend with his fathers. L. c. f. 102.

But although the tone of the court exercised so great an influence on the conduct of the bishops, and although both parties joined in annihilating the Ephesian transactions; yet the breach between them still continued, and the imperial ministers, who were to see to it that the emperor's designs at the council were carried into effect, found it by no means so easy to unite them together by means of a common symbol of faith, and thereby to put an end to the divisions in the Oriental church, the fresh outbreaks of which were an object of continual dread. The very proposal to draw up a new symbol of this kind met from many with determined resistance, because doubtless they saw through the motives of policy, which would not harmonize with their dogmatic zeal, and hence wanted confidence in the whole thing.* Meantime the patriarch Anatolius, while the other business of the council went on, proceeded to discuss with a select number of bishops the matters of faith. With those who had many objections to make against the articles in the letter of Leo, which was to obtain the authority of a creed, he entered into an examination of their scruples, and endeavoured to remove them, in which, too, he seems to have been successful. But when the symbol which resulted from those secret deliberations came to be laid before the assembly, new difficulties and objections could not fail to arise. For although a reconciliation was thereby to be brought about between the two parties, yet it was unavoidable that there should be a decided preponderance one way or the other, either in favour of the Egyptian, or else in favour of the Romano-Oriental form of doctrine; and, accordingly, either one or the other of the parties must be offended. The symbol of faith first proposed† seems to have been drawn up particularly with a view to accommodate the prevailing interest of the Egyptian party. It contained the article, that Christ consists of two natures, which doubtless accorded with the Egyptian creed; for that affirmed that the natures should be distinguished from each other in conception, though not in their actual being.‡ But some of the Oriental

* See Concil. Chalc. act. II. f. 286.

† There were doubtless good reasons for not incorporating this with the other acts of the council; and hence we can only gather its contents from the way in which it was received.

‡ That this was the main point may be collected from the negotiations

bishops were dissatisfied with that symbol, which was received by the other party with loud demonstrations of applause. The Roman delegates declared that, if the council could not agree with the letter of Leo, they wished liberty to return home; and a council should be held at Rome. This threat, which caused a schism to be feared between the Oriental and the Occidental church, was sufficient to frighten the imperial court; and it was the more earnestly desired to gratify Leo, inasmuch as it was hoped that, by showing respect to his doctrinal decisions, he might be induced to recognize the rank conceded to the patriarch of Constantinople. (See vol. III. p. 242.) It was for this reason so much pains had already been taken to give the validity of a creed to the letter of Leo addressed to Flavian, with which a part of the bishops could not be satisfied.* The civil dignitaries therefore proposed the appointment of a new committee to examine the symbol of faith, to which delegates should be chosen from the different parties, particularly six Orientals; and these should hold their meetings and deliberations under the presidency of the Roman delegates, as well as of the patriarch Anatolius. But the proposal to change the symbol of faith was received by many of the bishops with loud tokens of disapprobation. The imperial commissioners deemed it necessary to draw up a report of the doubtful temper of the bishops to the emperor, and wait for his commands. The emperor's decision appeared; and it was

of the patriarch Anatolius with the bishops whom he sought to persuade to agree in an alteration of the creed. On the same principles which had moved them to consent to the deposition of Dioscurus, said he to them, they must also consent to reject the creed; for Dioscurus had deposed Flavian for no other reason than because he maintained the doctrine of the two natures; but the creed contained the article that Christ consists of (not subsists in) two natures. He would doubtless say, the creed contained the doctrine of Dioscurus, who had been condemned, not of Flavian, who had been justified, by the council. But the bishops who were in favour of the symbol maintained, on the other hand, that Dioscurus had not been deposed for doctrinal reasons. See act. V. f. 449.

* Leo was asked, in a letter addressed to him by the synod, to manifest, by that concession, his thanks to the emperor for having given the force of law to the doctrinal decision of the Roman bishop, and to the patriarch, for having united with him in establishing the pure doctrine. See Mansi concil. T. VII. f. 154. So, too, for the like purpose, the patriarch Anatolius himself hinted at his own services in this respect to the bishop Leo, in a letter addressed to the latter, which was first published among the works of Leo, by the brothers Ballerini. Mansi VII. f. 171.

ordered that either the proposal for the nomination of a committee should be adopted, and that by these such a symbol should be drawn up as all could be satisfied with, and against which no scruples could be raised; or else all should, by their metropolitans, propose their own faith, and in this way all discord be removed; or, if they could not be satisfied with this, no other course remained than to take measures, since the unity of faith could not be settled here, for holding a general council in the West. This last was a threat well calculated to have an effect on the bishops. They must have a creed dictated to them by the Roman bishop and a Roman council. But the threat produced at first nothing but exasperation. Such expressions were heard as the following: those who were not satisfied with the ancient symbol were Nestorians; these might go; they might take up their journey to Rome. The commissioners then declared, though doubtless not till after many other things had transpired which have not been reported to us, Dioscurus had avowed it as his doctrine that Christ consists of two natures, but could not allow that two natures subsisted in Christ. Leo teaches that two natures are united without confusion, without change, and without separation, in one and the same Christ. With which of these two do you agree? The bishops—who could hardly all of them be the same as had opposed every change in the ancient creed—now exclaimed, “We all have the same faith with Leo; whoever contradicts this faith is a Eutychian.” Upon this the commissioners suggested, that nothing more was needed than to receive into the creed that article from the letter of Leo. After this proposal had been generally received, they held with the select committee a secret meeting, in which the new symbol of faith was drawn up accordingly. In this it was defined that the one Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, should be recognized in two natures,* so that all confusion, change, and

* Not only the report of the monk Euthymius (see his account of the life of Cyrill in *Analectis Græcis*, Paris, 1688) and of Evagrius prove that the reading of the Latin copies of the symbol is the correct one, and the reading of the Greek *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* is false; but also the whole course of proceedings in the council proves this. Manifestly the earlier symbol, more favourable to the Egyptian system of doctrine, contained the *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, and the favouring of the other party consisted mainly in converting the *ἐκ* into *ἐν*. Moreover, the *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* does not suit the connection: the verb *γινώριζόμενον* points rather to the original *ἐν*.

division of the two^o natures is excluded.* No one should be allowed to profess any other creed than this; to teach or to *think otherwise*.

While all the rest who had been active in the second Ephesian council testified their repentance, and requested to be forgiven, the patriarch Dioscurus, on the other hand, persisted in his opposition. He refused to recognize the judicial authority of the council; and, after having been thrice summoned in the customary form, still remained firm in his refusal. Meanwhile, in addition to what was objected to his behaviour at the second Ephesian council, many grave charges, affecting his moral character and his administration of the episcopal office, were brought against him by Alexandrian ecclesiastics. Instead of being humbled, he had the boldness himself to excommunicate the Roman bishop. He was accordingly deprived of all his spiritual titles and dignities.

But although the person of Dioscurus was sacrificed, even by those who had previously consented to serve as his instruments, yet the fanatical hatred of his party towards the Orientals was still manifested in various ways, and particularly by the outrageous manner in which the venerable bishop, Theodoret, was received by the council. When, in compliance with a petition of his own, the case of Theodoret in the eighth session of the council was to be taken up, and he accordingly appeared among the assembled ecclesiastics, and referred to the petition about to be read as a testimony of his faith, he was constantly interrupted by the cry: They would allow nothing to be read; all he had to do was to condemn Nestorius. "Speak out clearly, Anathema to Nestorius and his doctrines; anathema to Nestorius and his friends!" It is easy to see that Theodoret was not prepared to condemn Nestorius at once and without any farther qualification; but that yet he was ready to make any sacrifice for the sake of peace, which he could do consistently with his convictions and with the demands of conscience. He had no hesitation in condemning what men had become wont to designate as the Nestorian heresy. We see that Theodoret could now yield more than he would have been willing to concede at an earlier period. "Truly," said he with dignified

The *ἐν δύο φύσιν* or the *ἐκ δύο φύσεων* was the turning point of the whole controversy between the Monophysites and the Duophysites.

* Ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἄχωρίστως.

composure, "I speak not otherwise than as I know is well-pleasing to God. In the first place, I would convince you, that my bishopric is not to me so very dear an interest; that I am not solicitous for the honour, and that it is not *for the sake of it* I have come here, but because I have been calumniated. I have come to prove myself an orthodox man, to show you that I condemn Nestorius and Eutyches, and every man who speaks of two Sons of God." Again it was loudly vociferated: "Say anathema to Nestorius, and to all who think like him." But he was afraid to condemn Nestorianism, without having first unfolded what he deemed to be *the pure doctrine*, lest some occasion should be given for employing that vague word Nestorianism for the purpose of condemning that which, according to *his own convictions*, was much rather the true doctrine. Hence he said: "If I may not be allowed, in the first place, to explain how I believe, I cannot express that anathema; but I believe"—here the bishops cried out: "He is a heretic; he is a Nestorian; cast forth the Nestorian." Theodoret then said: "Anathema to Nestorius, and to every one who calls not Mary the mother of God, and who divides the one only-begotten Son into two sons. I have subscribed the confession of faith and the letter of the bishop Leo; and so I believe. Farewell." The emperor's commissioners thereupon declared that Theodoret had now given sufficient proof of his orthodoxy, and it only remained, that, as he had been justified by the Roman bishop, he should be restored to his church. To this proposal of the court the assembly now acceded by acclamation.*

* Amidst these scenes at Chalcedon, we no longer perceive in Theodoret that constancy and firmness with which he had hitherto defended his innocent friend. He appears no longer faithful even to those professions which he earlier expressed; yet this may have been the effect of a momentary weakness. He may have deemed it best to yield for the moment to the fury of blind zealots, who would not listen to the voice of reason; especially as he explicitly stated, that with the name Nestorius he really condemned only a particular error, to express which men had been pleased to coin this term—and it is easy to see that he felt himself placed under constraint. But in the strongest contrast with his former behaviour stands the way in which he speaks, as, for instance, near the conclusion, in one of his latest works, his account of the heresies (*αἰρετικῆς κακομολίας ἱστορίαι*), respecting his old friend, where he describes him as an instrument of Satan: as a man who by his pride plunged the church into disorders: who, under the pretext of orthodoxy, introduced at one and the

Again, an incident which happened during the fourth action of the council foreshadowed what was to be expected from the dominant fanaticism in Egypt. Ten aged bishops from this country declined to anathematize at once, as they were required to do, the doctrines of Eutyches, and to subscribe the letter of Leo to Flavian. Such was the despotic authority of the Alexandrian bishops over the Egyptian church, that they declared it impossible for them, according to the church laws, to act in this case independently : they must wait for the decision of the new patriarch of Alexandria, who was still to be elected, and govern themselves accordingly. In vain it was objected, that they ought not in matters of religious conviction to make themselves dependent on the authority of any individual man ; and that the sentence of the general council must possess more force than that of an individual bishop. They implored the council to allow them indulgence, because in their own country they could not be certain of their lives if they ventured to declare themselves independent of their patriarch. This delay was finally granted them, under the condition that they should not leave Ephesus until the new patriarch was elected.

The council of Chalcedon, by proceeding in this manner, could not, of course, secure the object they had in view, which was to effect a union of the two parties. The weak spots which this assembly discovered by the inward contradictions brought to view during the course of its proceedings ; the exchange of one confession of faith for another ; the influence

same time the denial of the divinity and of the incarnation of the only-begotten Son ; one who met at last with the punishment he deserved, and the premonitory sign of his future punishment. Fear of the blind zealots alone assuredly could not lead him thus to contradict himself ; vexation at the disorders which had grown out of Nestorius' attack upon the term *Θεότοκος* (with which even *he* was not satisfied), must in the end have cast a shade in his soul on the memory of the author of those disturbances. But, nevertheless, we have here a melancholy proof of human weakness in a man who otherwise appears to us as a light in an age of darkness. Fain would we agree with those who have considered this clause to be spurious, were there not so much stronger reasons for the contrary supposition, and were it possible also to consider the letter addressed to Sporacius on the Nestorian heresy an interpolated piece, derived for the most part from that latter clause. For the rest, Theodoret perhaps spent the last six or seven years of his life, as he designed to do, ep. 146, in seclusion and in the occupation of writing.

of court policy on the final result—all this was, of course, ill-suited to procure authority for the decisions of this council in the minds of those who entertained other opinions.*

When so passionate a fanaticism in favour of the Egyptian monophysitism had manifested itself at this council of Chalcedon, it was no wonder that it should soon be more widely spread by the adherents of Dioscurus on their return home; and that it should find its way among the swarms of wild and untutored monks who were used to these formulas, and produce among them the most violent agitations. In the doctrine of the two natures, these people saw nothing but pure Nestorianism, a dividing of the one Christ into two Sons of God, two persons. That he who is supreme over nature was still born in the natural way,—this, they declared, was enough for them to know. The *how* was what they could not explain.† This was the germ of the *Monophysite* controversies, so disastrous to the Oriental church, so pernicious to practical Christianity.

Palestine and Egypt were, at first, the chief seats of this controversy. The fanatical monk Theodosius, who returned from the Chalcedonian council to Palestine, conveyed thither the seeds of discord. He attached himself to the party of the deceased emperor's widow Eudocia, and soon ruled supreme in all the cloisters. He set every thing in commotion, raging furiously against all who would not secede from the Chalcedonian council. The patriarch Juvenalis of Jerusalem was banished from his city, and Theodosius himself nominated patriarch there by his party. Similar things occurred in other

* The Monophysites well understood how to avail themselves of these weak spots laid open by the council, as we may see from the charges they brought against it; to which Leontius of Byzantium or Jerusalem, at the end of the sixth century, replied, in his work against the Nestorians and the Eutychians. See this work in the Greek original, published by Mansi, Concil. VII. f. 799. If the charge brought by the Monophysites (f. 813) really implied that many votes at the council had been purchased with gold, this accusation would assuredly be confirmed by the bad defence of Leontius. But this does not lie in the words: they speak only of simony in the appointment of bishops. The word *χειροτονίας* must be understood to refer, not to a vote in the council, but to ordinations.

† In the petition of the monks from Palestine: The *μὴ χεῖρας Φυρί-λογειν πῶς γεννᾷ κατὰ φύσιν τὸν ὑπὲρ φύσιν*; Harduin. Concil. II. f. 672.

cities. Provinces were wasted with fire and sword; Theodosius deposed and appointed bishops. It was finally necessary to check this evil by resorting to forcible measures.

The second theatre of these contests was Egypt, and particularly Alexandria. There Proterius had been nominated patriarch in the place of the deposed Dioscurus; but, from what we have already seen taking place at Chalcedon, we may easily gather that Dioscurus would still have a weighty party in his favour. There arose a schism, which gave rise to the most violent disorders. It became necessary to call in the aid of soldiers: the attempt to suppress the schism by force only served, as usual, to exasperate men's minds, and many scenes of violence ensued. Finally, quiet was restored, and so it continued as long as Marcian lived; although the Monophysite party, headed by the presbyter Timotheus Ailurus, continued to subsist as a separate and distinct one. But as the Monophysite party, after the death of this emperor in 457, indulged the expectation of finding a more favourable disposition in his successor, they ventured to appoint and to ordain Timotheus as their patriarch. The attempt made by the military commandant, to put an end to the difficulties by force, led to a tumult, in which Proterius was murdered. Both parties now applied to the emperor with petitions. The latter, being aware of the great importance of the Monophysite party, were the more desirous of removing the schism by means of some mutual agreement, without resorting to force. He begged the Roman bishop Leo the Great to come himself to the East, and direct the negotiations. But Leo had no inclination to do this. Moreover, he was of the opinion that no concessions ought to be made at the expense of doctrines expressed by a council under the guidance of the Holy Ghost; but that these must only be strictly maintained. The bad result of a general council assembled for the purpose of restoring peace having at last been made evident by the example of the council of Chalcedon, the emperor made trial of another expedient. He issued a command to all the metropolitans to consult with their bishops respecting the manner in which the council of Chalcedon, and the ordination of Timotheus, ought to be regarded and treated, and to report to him the result of their deliberations. Distinguished above others for a wise moderation, rare in this age, was the opinion

expressed on this occasion by the bishops of Pamphylia. We here meet with a distinction lying far remote from the fanatical habits of doctrinal conception peculiar to this period—the distinction between that which belongs to the essence of Christian faith, and that which belongs to the exactness of doctrinal definitions requisite for the development of theology. “Those definitions,” said they, “were drawn up by the Roman bishop Leo, and by the council of Chalcedon, not for the purpose of having them pass to the laity, and give offence to them; but they were designed for the priests, that they might have wherewith to answer gainsayers. The doctrine concerning the union of two natures in one Christ was not employed for the instruction of catechumens, but only for the purposes of theological discussion. They were of the opinion that there ought to be no dispute on the questions, whether Christ *subsisted in* two natures, or *consisted of* two natures, and whether we should speak of one nature of the Word which became man: the only important thing was, that the union of the two natures should be maintained, but without being confounded. They recommended the condescending indulgence, of which Christ was the pattern, as the best and readiest means of reclaiming errorists, and of restoring tranquillity.*

Since the majority of voices, however, now maintained the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and were opposed to the ordination of Timotheus Ailurus, the emperor Leo resolved that he would put an end to the difficulties by force. In the year 460, Timotheus Ailurus was banished to Cherson, and in his place Timotheus Salophaciolus was appointed patriarch of Alexandria. The mild character of the latter enabled him for the moment to do something towards restoring tranquillity.

So much the more violent, however, was the ferment which ensued, when, by a political revolution, the hitherto oppressed party of the Monophysites at once obtained the preponderance. This took place in 476, when Basiliscus succeeded in expelling the emperor Zeno, successor to his father-in-law Leo, in the year 474, from the imperial throne, and securing it for himself. Whether the fact was that he had not attained to this high eminence without the aid of the Monophysite party, or whether he hoped to find in this party an important support,

* See Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 731.

he showed from the beginning that it was his purpose to make it the ruling party in the East. He was the first to publish decisions on matters of faith by imperial laws; for, in entering on his reign, he issued a circular letter (*ἐγκύκλιον*) to be signed by all the bishops on pain of being deposed from their office, whereby it was established that the Nicene creed, together with the several decrees in confirmation of it passed at the councils of Constantinople and Ephesus, should alone be valid; while, on the other hand, the Chalcedonian symbol and the letter of Leo were condemned as standing at variance with this, and ordered to be burned wherever they might be found. Many of the bishops readily complied with the imperial command; partly such as, being rather inclined of themselves to adopt the Monophysite opinion, had only been moved by the ruling power to accept the Chalcedonian articles; and partly such as were always in the habit of shaping their opinions according to the doctrinal tendency of the court.

At Alexandria the victory of the Monophysite party would take place without any violent struggle, for this party had there a natural preponderance. Timotheus Ailurus resumed his patriarchate, and the mild Timotheus Salophaciolus quietly returned back to his cloister. But violent commotions arose in many districts, where hitherto the party of the Chalcedonian council had prevailed; and enthusiastic monks, who exercised the greatest influence over the people, stirred them up to resistance against the imperial command. The patriarch Acacius of Constantinople, although wavering himself, yet took courage, from the strength of the zealots, to show resistance to the emperor. And as, in addition to this, Zeno had, in the mean time, strengthened his power, Basiliscus issued, in 477, a second circular (*ἀντεγκύκλιον*), whereby the first was revoked. Soon after this the victory of Zeno, who once more made himself master of the empire, changed the whole face of affairs.

This emperor was the more firmly resolved in the outset to do all in his power to advance the party of the council of Chalcedon, because doubtless he was especially indebted to this party for the recovery of his throne, and because his political interests would make him hostile to the other party, which Basiliscus had favoured. This change of court orthodoxy was soon followed by the usual consequences attending such

lamentable dependence of the church on the state. Those same bishops of Asia Minor who, under the preceding reign, had defended themselves before the emperor Basiliscus against the charge of having only subscribed his circular letter by constraint and from motives of fear; who had styled this document, in their communication to him, a divine and apostolic letter;* who had declared to him that the world must go to ruin if he did not uphold the authority of his religious edict; who called on him to depose the patriarch Acacius from his seat—these same bishops now testified to this very patriarch their repentance, writing to him that they had subscribed the circular letter of Basiliscus, not from conviction, but because they were compelled to it; but that in their faith they really agreed with that which had been piously and rightly determined at the council of Chalcedon.†

This change must have had a very great influence, especially on the condition of the Alexandrian church, in which the Monophysite party was ever predominant. Timotheus Ailurus was allowed, it is true, peacefully to end the few remaining days of his old age in the patriarchal office; but when, after his death in 477, the Monophysite party proceeded to choose the archdeacon Petrus Mongus as his successor, the emperor looked upon this as an insurrection: he pronounced sentence of death on Petrus Mongus, and the latter seems to have escaped the execution of this sentence only by flight. It was ordered that Timotheus Salophaciolus should be restored to the patriarchate of Alexandria. The emperor threatened all laymen and ecclesiastics who should not within two months recognize Salophaciolus as their patriarch, with the loss of all their dignities and churches, and with exile.‡ The restored patriarch Timotheus was enabled for the moment, by his moderation and gentleness, to preserve quiet at Alexandria. He presented a rare example for this age—protecting instead of persecuting the Monophysite party, insomuch that the emperor had to admo-

* The *Θείον*—divinum,—the usual designation, indeed, derived from the pagan times, and applied to whatever came from the emperor; but it was bad enough in bishops, when speaking of religious matters, to imitate such phraseology.

† Comp. Evagr. hist. eccles. III. c. 5 and 9.

‡ See the letters of the Roman bishop Felix III. to the patriarch Acacius, and to the emperor Zeno.

nish him to use greater severity towards the heretics, and not allow them to hold their church assemblies and to baptize; but, notwithstanding this, he still continued to pursue the same course of conduct. Hence he was universally esteemed by the Alexandrians, and they would call out to him in the streets and in the churches—"Although we have no church-fellowship with you, yet we love you."*

But after the death of Timotheus Salophaciolus, which soon ensued, there arose a new schism. The party which was by far the most numerous, that of the Monophysites, chose for their patriarch the archdeacon Petrus Mongus; the minor party of the Chalcedonian council chose the chief treasurer of the Alexandrian church, John Talaya. The emperor at first was resolved to approve the choice of the Chalcedonian faction alone; but a complication of events led him to change his mind.

John Talaya, at that time presiding as presbyter over the churches on the island of Tabennæ, had been sent by the patriarch Timotheus Salophaciolus, after the latter had been reinstated in his office by the emperor Zeno, on a mission to Constantinople, in company with Gennadius, a kinsman of the patriarch, and bishop of Lower Hermupolis. Gennadius remained behind at Constantinople, and had there acquired great influence as plenipotentiary or agent (apocrisarius) of the Egyptian patriarch. John Talaya, however, had entered into a connection with Illus, one of the first men of the empire, to whom the emperor was in part indebted for the recovery of his throne; and probably at this time Illus engaged, perhaps not without the assurance of receiving a splendid remuneration from Talaya, that he would procure for him the patriarchate after the death of the aged Timotheus. For this reason, after his return to Egypt, Talaya gave up his office in the church at Tabennæ, and resumed the post which he had before occupied at Alexandria, so that he might be ready, on the death of Timotheus, immediately to make such arrangements as would secure the attainment of his object beyond all fear of a failure. From this place he sent many and valuable presents to Illus. Relying on the patronage of this powerful man, he deemed it

* See *Liberati Diaconi breviarium causæ Nestorianorum et Eutychianorum*, ed. Garnier, pag. 108.

the less necessary to secure the good-will of Gennadius, whom he had left behind at Constantinople, or of the patriarch himself; and by this neglect he made them both his enemies. The deputy whom he sent with his inaugural letter (*ἐνθρονιστικά*) to Constantinople, was instructed not to present this immediately to the patriarch, but first inquire after his patron, the influential Illus, and to proceed in all respects as he should direct; but as the latter was then at Antioch, the deputy of John Talaya set off for that city without presenting his letter to the patriarch.* By this unexampled neglect of the honour due to him as bishop of the imperial residence, the patriarch Acacius was completely disgusted; and as Illus soon after rebelled against the emperor, Acacius was the more easily enabled to make John Talaya hateful also to the emperor Zeno. Peter Mongus, the head of the Monophysite party, was cunning enough to turn these circumstances to his own advantage. He visited Constantinople in person, and pointed out the danger to which the exasperation of the numerous party of the Monophysites might expose the tranquillity of the state, if a patriarch were thrust upon them whom they could not approve. He proposed, on the other hand, a treaty by which he hoped to unite all in one church. Acacius entered into this scheme, and persuaded the emperor to favour it. The latter issued, in the year 482, a treaty of agreement addressed to the churches of the Alexandrian patriarchate, which, by omitting the expressions employed in the disputed questions, and abiding only by general terms, was expected to bring about the removal of this opposition. It was here determined that no other creed should be valid than the Nicene-Constantinopolitan symbol, which had been confirmed at Ephesus. A symbolical authority was given to the anathemas of Cyrill, and, without mentioning names and persons, or the nature of the dispute, it was declared that Christ is one and not two,† since miracles and sufferings were referred to one and the same person. Moreover, sentence of condemnation was pronounced not only on Nestorianism and Eutychianism, but also on all who taught or had taught contrary to these articles, whether at Chalcedon or in any other synod or place whatsoever.‡

* See *Liberat.* c. 16 and 17, and Theophanes' *chronography*.

† *Ἐν τὴν ἑκάντην καὶ οὐ δύο.*

‡ *Evagr.* III. 14.

This *concordate* was now designed, in the purpose of the emperor, to serve as a basis for the peace of the church. Those among the Monophysites who agreed to subscribe it should, without being required to give up their peculiar opinions, be received by the other party into the communion of the church; and also the latter should be left free to retain their peculiar doctrines, and for themselves to maintain the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and of Leo's letter to Flavian. But without interfering with these differences, the concordate should stand valid as the basis of church fellowship, and neither party should stigmatize the other as heretical; but such an object was not to be attained in this way. The zealous Monophysites demanded an explicit condemnation of the council of Chalcedon, and of the letter to Flavian; and as they separated from the moderates, who were satisfied with the concordate, without having any principal leader, they were from henceforth designated as the headless sect (*Acephaloi*). Now when those bishops who chiefly agreed with this party in their doctrinal opinions, allowed themselves to be influenced by their respect for it, they lost the confidence of those with whom, by means of the compromise, they had concluded a peace. On the other hand, the zealous adherents of the Chalcedonian council were far from being satisfied with a written contract in which this council was spoken of in such disparaging terms; and all who accepted the compromise appeared to them as Monophysites. Thus it happened, that the henoticon, instead of doing away the schism, only made it worse than it was before. Instead of two parties, there were now four—the zealots on both sides and the moderates of the two parties who accepted the compromise. The warm adherents of the Chalcedonian council found great sympathy in the Roman church, and these stigmatized the dominant party of the Oriental church as heretical. A schism between the Eastern and the Western church was the consequence of this.

While these commotions growing out of the henoticon were still in progress, the Emperor Zeno, A.D. 491; died, and was succeeded by Anastasius. The latter was only desirous of preserving peace, and of silencing the heretic-makers on both sides; and for this reason he would not suffer the treaty of coalition to drop. But this moderation, proceeding from

motives of policy, could only make him an object of suspicion to the zealots; and as he would tolerate nothing which was opposed to his plans, in seeking to preserve peace, he appeared in the light of a persecutor. Serious disturbances, arising out of the struggle between the two parties, broke out during this emperor's reign in Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Constantinople; and his efforts to compel the enthusiasts to moderation were attended with no other result than to render the commotions more violent. As he exerted himself with the most vigour to repress the enthusiasts near by, in Constantinople itself, he must of course become suspected of favouring the Monophysites. In the patriarch of Constantinople he found a violent antagonist. By the patriarch Euphemius, the orthodoxy of the emperor had been suspected from the first; he had consented to his taking the throne only on condition that the emperor should give him a written assurance that he would attempt to do nothing against the authority of the Chalcedonian council. Anastasius soon endeavoured to get rid of him, which he could not do without exciting a tumult among the people. The presbyter Macedonius, in whom, until now, no one had ever witnessed any symptom of passionate zeal, was nominated his successor; but he too must soon incur the imperial displeasure, since he was not willing to lose his character for orthodoxy among the zealots of the party attached to the Chalcedonian council; and therefore connected himself more closely with them than suited the emperor's plans. Besides this, two men of vigorous activity now took the lead of the hitherto headless but zealous Monophysite party; and, in other districts, disturbances arose, the influence of which spread to Constantinople. One of these persons, Xenayas, of Tahal in Persia, had already contended zealously against the Nestorians in his own country. Afterwards he had betaken himself to Syria; and the Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria, Peter the clothier, so called after the trade which he pursued as a monk* (originally one of the monks associated with Eutyches at Constantinople), had made him bishop of the city of Hieropolis or Mabug. By the same dignity his name also was changed into the Greek form Philoxenos, and by this name he is best known as the promoter of the so-called Philoxenian Syriac translation of the New

* Πίτρος ὁ κναφεύς.

Testament. But with the successor of this Monophysite patriarch, with Flavian, who was more inclined to the doctrines of the Chalcedonian council, his zeal in giving spread to the Monophysite doctrines involved him in a quarrel; for though Flavian was willing to purchase peace by yielding many points, yet nothing could induce him expressly to condemn the doctrine of the two natures. Violent contests ensued, which spread even to the adjacent Palestine.

The second of these two new leaders of the Monophysite party was Severus, who came from Sozopolis in Pisidia. While a pagan, he had devoted himself to the study of the law, in the famous law-school at Berytus, and afterwards became an advocate. At Tripoli in Phœnicia, he received baptism, became a monk, and united himself with a society of zealous Monophysites. Banished by a hostile party, he came with a number of his companions to Constantinople, to seek protection from the emperor. He told him that the defence of the Chalcedonian council was the cause of all the disturbances; he sought to introduce a certain addition to the old and venerated church song, the trisagion (thē thrice holy, from Isa. vi.), which might serve as the basis of a coalition between the two parties. Some time before, the above-named Monophysite church-teacher, Peter the clothier, had already added to one of the invocations to God in that church hymn the clause Thou who wast crucified for us (ὁ σταυρώθεις δι' ἡμῶν). The transfer of predicates, which was expressed in this clause, in fact perfectly coincided with the Monophysite type of doctrine; but it might also, in another sense, precisely after the same manner as the term *θεότοκος* had already been adopted into the church phraseology, be admitted by the Duophysites as being opposed to Nestorianism; and, so, by this opposite reference of the same term, both parties might come together. Of this ambiguity Severus availed himself; but in the then existing ferment of minds at Constantinople, this addition appeared as a crass Monophysitism, as impinging on the immutability of the divine essence; and this innovation met with the most determined resistance. While, in the public worship of God, one party sang the old church-hymn in its simple form, the other burst in, loudly vociferating the added words. Thus the very solemnities of worship were profaned by expressions of worldly passion, and even by bloody contests. As the rumour spread

that the emperor favoured the addition to the church hymn, and was threatening to remove the patriarch Macedonius, a violent tumult broke forth. The houses of many of the grandees were burned; a monk, who was supposed to be the author of the addition, was seized by the infuriated populace and murdered, and his head was carried about in triumph stuck upon a pole. Then appeared the emperor at the circus before the assembled people, without his crown. He declared himself willing to lay down the government; but all could not reign at once, one must be sovereign. These words had their effect on the excited multitude; the people besought the emperor to retain the government, and promised tranquillity. The emperor took advantage of this favourable moment: he caused the patriarch Macedonius to be removed, and Timotheus, a presbyter, who had accepted the henoticon, was appointed his successor. Meanwhile, the emperor saw himself under the necessity, for many reasons, of yielding to the fury of the exasperated party of the Chalcedonian council, where this predominated. By this exasperation, aid and comfort was given to the insurrection of the military commander Vitalian, which broke out in the year 514; and Anastasius found himself compelled to enter into conditions of peace, to the advantage of the adherents of the Chalcedonian council. He promised to assemble a council at Heraclea in Thrace, and moreover to invite the assistance of the Roman bishop, so that, above all things, the church fellowship might thus be restored with the latter, which amounted to no more nor less than that the Chalcedonian council should be reinstated in its authority; for no hope certainly could be entertained of making peace with the Roman church *on any other terms than these*. Yet Anastasius sought to put off the fulfilment of these irksome conditions as long as he could; and the difficulties which were raised by the Roman church in conducting the negotiations for peace, facilitated his plans. The enthusiasm for the Chalcedonian council, and the hatred of Monophysitism and of the emperor Anastasius, who was considered to be its champion, did but mount so much the higher after the emperor's death, and at the commencement of the reign of his successor Justin, in 518.

When John, the patriarch of Constantinople under the new government, made his first appearance at the public worship, he was received by the assembled people with loud shouts,

demanding that, since the Manichean Anastasius no longer reigned, but the orthodox Justin, the authority of the Chalcedonian council should once more be publicly recognized; that the anathema should be pronounced on Severus, and on all the leaders of the Monophysite party; that all Monophysites should be removed from the imperial court and from the capital;* and that fellowship should be restored with the Roman church. The assembled multitude did not desist from their impetuous outcries till the patriarch yielded. Similar demands of ecclesiastics, monks, and laity, came also from other churches. As the emperor Justin, a rude Thracian, who took no interest himself in theological disputes, was governed by his two chief ministers, Vitalian and Justinian, who warmly espoused the doctrines of the Chalcedonian council, he would very easily be persuaded to every measure which favoured the interests of this party. New negotiations were entered into with the Roman bishop Hormisdas, and men were ready to consent to all the conditions prescribed by that

* See the protocol in the acts of the council under Mennas, Harduin. T. II. f. 1334 and 1355. The hatred was particularly manifested against the powerful lord chamberlain (*Præpositus sacri cubiculi*) Amantius. The multitude shouted in allusion to him: *Τὸν λόγον τοῦ παλατίου ἱζῶ βάλε*. He must doubtless have had great influence under Anastasius, in promoting Monophysitism; for, in calling upon the patriarch publicly to declare himself, it was exclaimed that, under the reign of a Justin, he needed have no fear of Amantius: *Οὐ φοβῆσαι Ἀμαντίον τὸν Μανιχαῖον, Ιούστινος βασιλευῖ*. l. c. Harduin. f. 1339. This Amantius, however, was hated and suspected by the emperor Justin; for he had conceived the project of making a certain count Theocritus emperor through whom he might hope to be ruler himself. He had for this purpose given a sum of money to Justin, then commander of the emperor's body guard, in order that, by a skilful distribution of it, he might purchase votes in favour of Theocritus; but Justin used the gold in behalf of himself, and became emperor. Of course he must now stand in dread of Amantius; and hence soon caused him to be executed. See Evagr. l. IV. c. 2, Theophanes, Chronograph, at the commencement of the reign of Justin. The assassination of Amantius, however, was deemed a judgment on the heretic. See the popular exclamation in an assembly in the church at Tyre, which likewise demanded the condemnation of the Monophysites. Harduin. l. c. f. 1359. *Ἀπίθανον Ἀμάντις ὁ ἀντάρτης τῆς τριᾶδος*. We discern here the hidden connection betwixt the plots of political and theological parties. The fear of the infection of Monophysitism was in many districts so great, that in Tyre, for example, the Egyptian dealers in wood were not suffered to remain in the city, lest they might spread the Monophysite heresy beyond Egypt. L. c. 1355.

bishop for the restoration of church-fellowship. Among these was the severe one, that the names of all the bishops who, under the preceding reign, had accepted the henoticon, or attached themselves to the Monophysite party, should be expunged from the church records. To anathematize the leaders of the Monophysite party was a point which might be easily secured; nor was there any hesitation at Constantinople even to surrender the patriarch Acacius to the popular will. But, in many districts, ecclesiastics and churches were not at all disposed to sacrifice the memory of their beloved bishops: they would not suffer themselves to be moved to this by arguments or by threats. New schisms and bloody disturbances were to be feared, if they were forced to this. The emperor himself, therefore, requested the Roman bishop to yield a little on this point.* The Monophysite clergymen, however, were deposed from their places. Severus, who had managed to make himself patriarch of Antioch, was threatened with a severer fate through the vengeance of the commander Vitalian, who had been injured by him; but he saved himself by fleeing to Egypt, where he met with a friendly reception from his Monophysite fellow-believers. There the party was too strong to be prudently attacked.

Justinian, the successor of this emperor, from the year 527, meant to be considered a zealous champion of the Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Intermeddling in theological disputes was with him a favourite passion; and he would very willingly have been lawgiver to the church, in the same sense as he was to the state; but the more he acted, or supposed he acted, by his own impulse, the more he served as the tool of others, who knew how to influence him by taking advantage of his weakness. Thus was he often obliged to subserve interests to which he was altogether opposed in his own intentions. In particular, his wife Theodora, who governed him, and who was herself attached to Monophysitism, successfully plotted many a scheme for the advantage of the Monophysite party, which he abhorred. She even went so far as to cause to be formed, under the very eyes of the emperor at Constantinople, a Monophysite society, whose branches extended through all

* See the correspondence between the patriarch of Constantinople, the emperor Justin, and the Roman bishop Hormisdas.

parts of the empire,* and to procure that a Monophysite should be elevated to the episcopate of the imperial residence; and every thing was prepared to raise up the Monophysites from their state of oppression to being the dominant party. Her principal agent in accomplishing all this was a person by the name of Arthimus. He had once been bishop over the church at Trapezund in Pontus; but, without waiting to be regularly dismissed from the pastoral relation, he had left his flock for the purpose, as he pretended, of having it in his power to lead a perfectly Christian life as a monk;* but probably, if we may judge from the sequel, he was led to this step, like so many others, by more doubtful motives; and the truth was, that the court life had more charms for him than the administering of a pastoral office distinguished by no outward splendour, in an insignificant town. He betook himself to Constantinople; there his ascetic garb procured for him distinguished consideration; he gained the confidence of the empress Theodora, and the alternate residence at the court and at a pleasant villa near Constantinople† suited him better than his former secluded life in the pastoral office. This person now drew around him all the most important men of the Monophysite party, who, under the protection of Theodora, visited Constantinople; and amongst these was Severus. At length, by the management of Theodora, Anthimus, in the year 535, was nominated patriarch of Constantinople.‡ Of a surety, the emperor Justinian, who was so zealously orthodox, entertained no other idea than that his bishop was a staunch adherent of the Chalcedonian council. And perhaps the trick would have lasted still longer, and the cunning Theodora would have succeeded in accomplishing still more, if the whole plan had not been frustrated by an accident quite unforeseen, after the deception had been kept up no longer than a year. It happened that the Roman bishop Agapetus visited Constantinople as ambassadör of the East Gothic king Theodoric. Many dissatisfied ecclesiastics and monks took this

* In the first action of the council under Mennas, it says: *Οὗτος ἐκ πολλοῦ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκκλησίαν καταλίπων, καὶ πεπλασμένον βίον ἐγκρατείας ἀναλάβων*. F. 1195, l. c.

† His *προαστίον*, act. IV. sub Menna, f. 1243.

‡ Procopius, in his secret history of the court (*hist. arcana*), c. 17, says of Theodora: *Αὐτὴ τὰς τὲ ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐρωάνας ἐχειροτόνει*.

opportunity of presenting to the Roman bishop, who had less to fear than others from the anger of the empress, and could therefore act more independently at the court, a formal complaint against the bishop Anthimus, charging him partly with erroneous doctrines, and partly with unjustifiable proceedings to obtain the patriarchate of Constantinople. The Roman bishop required him to prove his orthodoxy by a confession of faith, and (in accordance with the church laws of the West, which forbade the transfer of bishops) to return back from the patriarchate of Constantinople to his earlier bishopric, which he had voluntarily abandoned. As Anthimus could not consent to this, Agapetus excommunicated him from the fellowship of the church, and moreover avoided all intercourse with him. The empress was unable to change the mind of the Roman bishop either by promises or by threats. When, through his influence, Justinian came to see how grossly he had been deceived, his indignation knew no bounds. Anthimus was deposed; and at the recommendation of Agapetus, the presbyter Mennas, superintendent of the great hospital at Constantinople, was nominated patriarch.*

The new patriarch, in the year 536, invited the bishops who happened to be then present in Constantinople, to meet in a synod (*σύνοδος ἐν ἐφημοῦσα*) for the purpose of putting a final seal on the condemnation of Monophysitism, and its defenders. The emperor Justinian accompanied the decrees of this council with a confirmatory law, altogether worthy of his despotic spirit: "The leaders of the Monophysite party should keep away from the residence and from all the more important cities; they should live quietly and without disturbance as private persons, and take good care how they corrupted others, and led them into blasphemy. The writings of Severus should be burned, and none should be permitted either to own or to transcribe them. Every person who dared to transcribe them should suffer the loss of his right hand."†

When the empress Theodora saw her plans defeated, she still did not relinquish her object; but, fruitful of intrigues, endeavoured to effect it in another way. She cultivated the acquaintance of the deacon Vigilius, who had come to Constantinople in the retinue of the Roman bishop Agapetus.

* See Concil. sub Menna, act. I. Liberati breviar. c. 21. *

† Harduin. Concil. T. II. f. 1406.

The ambition of this unprincipled man led her to hope that she might convert him into a suitable instrument for accomplishing her designs. Agapetus having died, either, as some report, before he left Constantinople, or according to others, while on his journey home, she held out to Vigilius the promise of a large sum of money and of the Roman bishopric, if he would pledge himself to overthrow the authority of the Chalcedonian council, and to testify in writing that he agreed in faith with Anthimus, and likewise with the other leaders of the Monophysite party. Vigilius consented to the conditions, and the whole intrigue was managed and conducted between two women. Antonina, the wife of the Greek general Belisarius, whose successful campaigns had extended the power of the East Roman empire in Italy, was the confidant of the empress and of her plans, and employed to co-operate with her in carrying them into execution. She worked upon her husband.

In the mean time, Silverius had already been appointed the successor of Agapetus. It was now necessary for him either to make the same engagements which Vigilius had made, or else give place for the latter. But, as he would not consent to sacrifice his convictions for any temporal advantage, he was falsely accused of a design to betray Rome to the Goths, the enemies of the Greek empire, which accusation might derive some colour of truth from the fact of the friendly relations formerly existing between the bishop and the king of the East Goths, and it was an easy matter for the faithless Greeks to fabricate records and testimonies. Silverius accordingly was banished, and Vigilius appointed bishop in the year 538.

More could be obtained from him, inasmuch as the cause of the faith stood with him in very slight account. In truth, he had but a very imperfect acquaintance with the controversies relating to it, and the interest he took in them was as slight as his knowledge of them. He confided to the hands of Antonina a letter addressed to Anthimus and the other leaders of the Monophysite party, in which he really expressed opinions wholly in accordance with the Monophysite views, and signified his agreement in faith with them; but at the same time he craftily requested them, in order that he might keep on good terms with all parties, to be careful not to divulge what he had written, but rather to put on the appearance of being

particularly suspicious about his faith, so that he might the more easily accomplish what he had undertaken.

While Vigilius then was thus bent on serving two parties, one secretly, the other openly, it was out of the power of Theodora to execute through him a single one of her projects; for he took good care not to make any public declaration in accordance with her views. She thus found that her money and her intrigues had been expended to no purpose; and, in being deceived herself in attempting to deceive others, she met the deserved punishment of cunning perfidy.

But, notwithstanding this, she did not yet give up her object; and in the irresistible propensity of the emperor Justinian to decide on matters which he did not understand, in the various manifold strifes between the theological parties at court, and in the unprincipled character of Vigilius, she could still find means that flattered her with a more favourable prospect of accomplishing that object, or at least of involving the opponents of Monophysitism in a quarrel among themselves. The opportunity for doing this was as follows: The old Syrian church-teachers, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas of Edessa, had, from the first, been special objects of the fanatical hatred and the heresy-hunting spirit of the Monophysite party. In the secret bargain which had procured for Vigilius the title of Roman bishop, he had pledged himself also to anathematize Theodore and Theodoret.*

From what had happened in a different quarter, the Monophysite court-party, who no longer dared to speak loud, found it in their power to unite with another party at court governed by a doctrinal interest entirely different from their own, for the accomplishment of this plan, which, as we see from the engagement entered into by Vigilius, had been long before projected. We must here cast a glance at certain events, which we shall notice more fully in another connection, but here only in a cursory manner.

The doctrines and writings of Origen, with which but few

* In the above cited letter to the Monophysite bishops, he concludes with the words: *Anathematizamus ergo Theodorum, Theodoretum et omnes qui eorum statuta coluerunt vel colunt.* Even Facundus of Hermione knew of this secret bargain of ambition. *De ipsius episcopi Romani chirographis ambitionis impulsu, quum fieri arderet episcopus, parti alteri factis.* Ep. ad Mocian. Sirmond. II. 593, E.

in the Oriental church were then accurately acquainted, and which in the Western church were wholly unknown, had just at this time met with great acceptance in the cloisters of Palestine; and a party of enthusiastic Origenists had there risen up, who were violently opposed by the zealots for the orthodoxy of the church. But this Origenistic party had so managed as to acquire great influence at court through the agency of two of their own abbots, Domitian, and particularly Theodore Ascidas. These had taken up their residence at Constantinople; and, by the zeal which they showed in defence of the Chalcedonian council, won the special regard of the emperor Justinian, and hence possessed great influence in the palace.* He made Domitian bishop of Ancyra in Galatia; Theodore Ascidas bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; but, notwithstanding these appointments, they resided at court still more than with their communities, and used their whole influence to protect and to advance the party of their fellow-believers in Palestine. The patriarch Peter of Jerusalem, who was opposed to the Origenists, could not sustain himself against the influence of the powerful court party, and was obliged, in spite of himself, to make many concessions, in order to preserve his patriarchal dignity against the court intrigues which under the emperor Justinian carried all before them. But could the eyes of the emperor be once opened to see what a heretic Origen had been, and what heresies were to be found in his writings, the Origenistic party was lost; and how easily might this be brought about! It actually was brought about by a coincidence of events coming from different quarters.

The patriarch Peter of Jerusalem, who longed to be delivered from the yoke of the Origenistic court party, instructed two abbots, who sided with the opponents of Origenism, to bring before him a formal complaint against the Origenists, setting forth the heresies of Origen in detail. This document he sent to the emperor with a letter, describing to him the commotions excited by the Origenistic party.† Besides this, Pelagius, the Apocrisarius of the Roman bishop, had come to Palestine on some particular ecclesiastical business with which he had been entrusted by the emperor. He was then joined

* *Πρώτης παρήρησίας ἐν τῇ παλατίᾳ μετασχοῦντις.* Cyrilli Scythopolitani vita S. Sabæ, s. 83. Cotelier. monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, T. III.

† L. c. vita Sabæ. c. 85.

by four monks, who accompanied him from Palestine to Constantinople, for the purpose of laying before the emperor extracts from the writings of Origen, in proof of his heresies, and of procuring their condemnation.* To a Roman ecclesiastic, the heresies of Origen would appear extremely dangerous; and perhaps Pelagius was governed by motives of policy, even more than by a solicitude for the purity of doctrines; for he had long been jealous of the great power of Theodore Ascidas at the imperial court;† and the condemnation of Origen's doctrines, as heretical, would furnish him an opportune means of procuring his downfall. The patriarch Mennas of Constantinople also, who doubtless had often felt annoyed by the dominion of Theodore, readily entered into this plan; and both united their efforts in urging the emperor to condemn Origen's heresies. To the latter a welcome opportunity was here presented for establishing, by a religious edict, his authority as lawgiver also for the church, which indeed was the grand object of his ambition.‡ In the year 541, he issued a document drawn out in detail, and addressed to the patriarch Mennas, which was perfectly in character with his despotic temper, and in which he endeavoured to show what a detestable heretic Origen was, by enumerating the titles of the several heresies with which he had been furnished in the manner above described. He invited the patriarch to assemble a "home synod" (σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα), and cause Origen and his doctrines to be condemned. A copy of these synodal proceedings should be sent to all bishops and abbots, to receive their respective signatures; and, for the future, no person should be appointed a bishop or an abbot, without first condemning Origen along with the other heretics.§ Similar let-

* As the letter which the patriarch Peter of Jerusalem sent to Constantinople was the same in substance with that which these four monks presented to the emperor, it might be that these monks, of whom Liberatus speaks (c. 33), and whose names are given by Evagrius (IV. 38), were no other than the delegates of the patriarch Peter.

† Liberatus, l. c. æmulus existens Theodoro.

‡ Liberatus. Annuit imperator facillime gaudens se de talibus causis iudicium ferre.

§ For according to the *beautiful* custom, introduced under the emperor Justinian, in order to obtain a spiritual office, it was necessary to subscribe such a condemnation of the most famous heretics, αἱρετικοὶ οἱ ἐξ ἰδοῦς ἐν τοῖς γενόμενοις λιβέλλοις ἀναθεματιζόμενοι.

ters the emperor caused to be despatched also to the other patriarchs. The execution of this measure would occasion no general disturbance, as the judgment of the church concerning Origen had long since been settled. Mennas held the synod required by the emperor, which decided according to the imperial command.

But the object which it was hoped to accomplish by this condemnation, namely to effect the ruin of the Origenistic party, was nevertheless defeated; for Theodore and Domitian sacrificed the truth, in order to save their own interests and that of their party; as, indeed, great liberty of accommodating one's self to circumstances was allowed by the principles of this Origenistic party, that the end sanctifies the means, and that the truth is not for all men. *They* likewise subscribed the decrees of the synod, and consequently nothing could be done to them.* They preserved their authority at court, and could still secretly work none the less effectually for the interest of the Origenistic party, insomuch that Theodore Ascidas ventured to threaten the patriarch Peter that he would cause him to be deposed unless he received the Origenistic monks who had been expelled back again to their cloisters.†

Doubtless, however, notwithstanding their success for the present in defeating the plots of their adversaries, they could feel no security for the future amid circumstances so threatening; for if their opponents could contrive to expose their hypocritical acquiescence in the condemnation of the Origenistic heresies, and their secret machinations in favour of a party condemned by an imperial command, a heavy disgrace awaited them. They must, therefore, anticipate the blow which might so easily crush them, and endeavour to turn it upon their adversaries. They must seek to draw off the attention of the emperor from the heresies of Origen, by occupying it with something else; thus they could unite with their other object the pleasure of taking revenge on their adversaries, by attacking them on the side of their doctrinal interests. All this was craftily combined in the plan of causing the anathema which had been pronounced on Origen to fall back on the Syrian church teachers Theodore, Ibas, and Theodoret. Such a measure would not appear to have come directly from

* Vita Sabæ, c. 85, near the end.

† Vita Sabæ, c. 86.

Monophysitism, for even by men who would never consent to be called Monophysites, sentence of condemnation had in fact been pronounced, in the controversy with Nestorianism, upon Theodore, as likewise upon many of the controversial writings belonging to the first period of the theological polemics of Theodoret. The man who was considered a pillar of orthodoxy, Cyrill himself, though to be sure a favourer of Monophysitism, had in fact condemned those Syrian church-teachers as heretics. But as those three church-teachers had ever been special objects of hatred to the Monophysite party; as this party had long been labouring to procure their condemnation; as two of them had been justified by the Chalcedonian council; such an attack would, of course, seem very much like a plot of the Monophysite party. What was known about the influence of the empress Theodora would serve to confirm this suspicion. The Origenistic party secured then, by this undertaking, an opportunity of vexing their opponents, who, like Mennas, were zealous defenders of the authority of the Chalcedonian council, and violently opposed to Monophysitism. They might expect that this proposal would create vastly greater commotions than the Origenistic controversies, and thus sink the latter in oblivion. They thus secured an opportunity also of forming an alliance with the court party favoured by the empress Theodora, which was still in existence, and of gaining in them an important support. Whether they were also actuated in this case by the particular interest of a theological party in causing Theodore, an opponent of the Origenistic school, to be condemned as a heretic, may remain doubtful, for this Origenistic party were more particularly interested in the peculiar *doctrinal* opinions of Origen, which, to be sure, were closely connected with his allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures; but Theodore of Mopsuestia had, strictly speaking, attacked only the principles of that method, while, in other respects, he decidedly agreed with Origen in many of his peculiar views of doctrine; as, for example, in the doctrine of restoration, which, under Origen's name, had been pronounced heretical.*

* That Theodore Ascidas had it in view, by these new commotions which he was the means of exciting, to bring the cause of Origen into oblivion, is not only asserted by Evagrius (iv. 38), *ἐκείνους τοὺς ἐφίλων ἱέλων*, but declared also by one of the heads of this party,

It would be no difficult matter to point out to the emperor Justinian many passages in the writings of Theodore, which could not fail to appear to him extremely offensive; and, besides this, it was possible here to take advantage, not only of his ruling passion generally, which was to set himself up as a lawgiver of the church, but also of another favourite plan, which at that very juncture he was agitating. He was using his efforts to bring back the Monophysites to reunite with the dominant church. For this reason, he was about to bring out under his own name a work in defence of the Chalcedonian council against the objections of the Monophysites. But now Theodore Ascidas and Domitian represented to him, that he would be able to effect his object in a much shorter and more certain way. The Monophysites, said they, particularly object to the council of Chalcedon and its adherents, that they have approved of Theodore, and of many writings of Theodoret and of Ibas of Edessa, which apparently favour Nestorianism. Now, if Theodore and those particular writings were condemned, this charge would be at once refuted. An important obstacle which had hitherto stood in the way of the recognition of the council of Chalcedon among the Monophysites, would

Domitian himself, in a letter to the Roman bishop Vigilius: *Hi vero qui proposuerunt hujusmodi (Origenis) dogma defendere, id implere nullo modo voluerunt; sed talem relinquentes conflictum, conversi sunt adversus Theodorum, et moliri cœperunt, quatenus anathematizaretur et ille, ad abolitionem, ut putabant, eorum, quæ contra Origenem mota constiterant.* Facund. Hermian. l. iv. c. 4. The same Facundus hints at the connection here with the schemes of the Monophysites: *Horum (of the Origenists) satellitio functa gens Eutychianorum perfida, ea quæ per se contra Chalcedonense concilium sæpe tentaverat, per ipsos latentes aggressa est, qui nobis non videbantur hac parte suspecti.* l. i. c. 2. Liberatus assigns, as the chief motive, the disparaging of the authority of the Chalcedonian council, and, as a subordinate one, the hostility to Theodore, because he had written against Origen, c. 24: *Eo quod Theodorus multa opuscula edidisset contra Origenem, et maxime quod synodus Chalcedonensis laudem ejus suscepit.* The former is confirmed also by Facundus of Hermiane, when he says that Theodore, by his work written against Origen, *de allegoria et historia*, had drawn upon himself the hatred of the Origenists, l. III. c. 6, unde odium Origenianorum incurrit. Still, however, it may have been nothing more than a wrong conclusion which led to this conjecture; for it is evident, for the reasons above cited, that this design was not connected, so very closely at least, with the interests of the Origenists; but at the same time it might have been a subordinate motive in the minds of enthusiastic followers of Origen.

thereby be removed at a single stroke ; and if the emperor, by bringing about this condemnation, succeeded in restoring peace to the church, he would thereby confer on the church an immense obligation, and secure for himself an enduring renown.* Such a plan, so craftily presented, could not be otherwise than agreeable to Justinian ; and the more so, as the influential Theodora, who understood the whole affair, gave it her firm support.†

The emperor was now urged to issue an edict as soon as possible on this subject ; for the party was well aware, that, when he had once done this, he would consider it as a matter involving his own imperial authority and honour, and would never be turned from it. In the year 544, Justinian published the edict, which from the three repeatedly mentioned points of which it treats, afterwards obtained the name of the edict de tribus capitulis (περὶ τριῶν κεφαλαίων). By this edict, which is known to us only from fragments, the anathema was pronounced on the person of Theodore and on his writings, on Theodoret's writings against Cyrill, and on the letter of Ibas,‡ as well as on all the defenders of the three chapters. The emperor was desirous, at the same time, of carefully guarding against everything which might seem like a disparagement of the authority of the Chalcedonian council, extending the anathema to those also who should draw any inference from this document to the prejudice of the council of Chalcedon.

This edict was now, in the first place, sent through the whole empire, and laid before the bishops, for the purpose of obtaining their written assent to it. Had it been possible in this way to secure the individual votes of all or of a majority of the bishops, the matter could be so represented as if the edict had been received by the whole church. But, in the case of an edict of this sort, the thing was not so easy to be effected as in the case of the edict against Origen ; for the new edict appeared at once to be an attack on the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and a favouring of the Monophysites. Very much depended on the votes of the four patriarchs of the East, as these had the greatest weight with the other bishops.

* Liberat. c. 24. Scribendi laborem eum non debere pati, quando compendio posset acephalos omnes ad suam communionem adducere.

† As Liberatus expressly intimates, l. c.

‡ Designedly expressed as follows : Quæ dicitur ab Iba esse facta.

The patriarch Mennas of Constantinople expressed himself at first utterly opposed to the substance of the edict, because he saw in it a disparagement of the authority of the council of Chalcedon. He declared, next, that he would wait till he could learn what was the decision of the Roman bishop. At length, however, he yielded to the authority of the emperor, and gave in his written acquiescence, but with the proviso that, in case the Roman bishop declared against the condemnation of the three chapters, his own declaration should be withdrawn.* So it turned also with the other three patriarchs of the East, who in the first place declared against it, but were induced, on being threatened that they should be deposed, to subscribe their assent.† The example thus set was now followed by the other bishops.‡ Those who subscribed, received splendid gifts; the few who declined, were deposed and banished.§

But, if the emperor found it easy to carry through his design in the East, which was so accustomed to slavish obedience, he met with a more determined resistance, from the first, among the bishops and clergy in North Africa, which country, just liberated from the despotism of the Vandals, was about to be exposed to that of the Byzantines. Here a more independent and free spirit in church life had been transmitted from the school of the great Augustin. Here, men had learned how to contend for the faith under the persecution of the Vandal kings. Those only who had already become accustomed to change their opinions like a coat, to please the party in power,—who under the Vandals had been Arians, and under Justinian had again exchanged Arianism for a zealous adoption of the Nicene doctrine,—entered now also warmly into the condemnation of the three articles.|| When the

* Facundus Hermianens. l. IV. c. 4. Facundus here very justly reproaches him with being more concerned about the judgment of man than the judgment of God. In quo satis ostendit, de judicio se potius humano, quam divino esse sollicitum. † Facundus, l. c.

‡ A characteristic description of the Greek bishops is to be found in a document of this period: Sunt Græci episcopi habentes divites et opulentas ecclesias, et non patiuntur duos menses a rerum ecclesiasticorum dominatione suspendi: pro qua re secundum tempus et secundum voluntatem principum quicquid ab eis quæsitum fuerit, sine alteratione consentiunt. From the letter of the Roman clergy to the Frankish envoys at Constantinople. Mansi Concil. T. IX. f. 153.

§ Liberatus, towards the end.

|| As Facundus (lib. contra Mocianum) says of a certain one: Qui

imperial edict with the demand for signatures first arrived in North Africa, the bishop Pontianus replied to the emperor, that those writings to which the edict referred were as yet unknown in those parts. But, even if they were acquainted with those works, and if they found in them much that was at variance with the doctrines of the faith, they might be on their guard against such passages, but would not hastily condemn their authors, who were already dead. If such writers were still living, and would not themselves condemn the errors objected to them, then with all propriety they might be condemned; but now, they stood before the infallible judge, from whom there was no appeal. He concluded with saying, that the emperor would do well to take heed, lest, in seeking to condemn persons who were already dead, he might fall into the great mistake of condemning many now living to death for their disobedience, and lest he should at last be called to account for this by him who would come to judge the quick and the dead. As among the Africans, so also among the bishops of Illyria and of Dalmatia, the edict met with determined resistance.

So many tokens of an unfavourable disposition towards the imperial edict having manifested themselves in the Western church, where the arm of Byzantine despotism was not so strong, it seemed the more important to the emperor that the people of the West should be wrought upon through some weighty authority in the church. Hence, above all, he must seek to gain over the voice of the Roman bishop Vigilius, from whom, owing to the fickleness of his character, no very decided resistance was to be apprehended; and who had in truth already pledged himself in favour of the Monophysite party; a fact of which the emperor, indeed, was not aware, but which was doubtless well remembered by the party which had a hand in all these intrigues. Vigilius, who possessed neither the learning, nor the independent judgment in theology which qualified him to decide with safety on these disputed matters, was, in all probability, the person who, at the very outset, instructed his two deacons, Anatolius and Pelagius, to get a learned ecclesiastic of Carthage, the deacon Fulgentius Fer-

Wandalis regnantibus Arianus fuit deinde imperio succedente Romano cum tempore versus est, ut catholicis videretur, nunc etiam de palatio præjudiciis religionis catholicæ exortis, eadem sequitur.

randus,* to draw up an opinion on this subject. They directed him to consult with the bishop of Carthage, or with other wise and judicious men; and they themselves expressed a suspicion, from which doubtless we may infer what was the then disposition of Vigilius himself, that this whole business might have originated in a secret plot of the Monophysite party.†

Thereupon, Fulgentius Ferrandus, in a free spirited reply, declared decidedly against the reception of the imperial edict, for three several reasons:—I. The supreme authority of general councils, particularly of those held with the consent of the Roman church, which, according to the sacred scriptures, held the first rank. Hence what had once been decided by the council of Chalcedon, ought not to be subjected to any new investigation. Let the decisions of the council be attacked, even but in a single article, and its entire authority was immediately unsettled. A distinction between determinations of fact and determinations of doctrine he would not admit to have any force.—II. That persons deceased were removed from the jurisdiction of a human tribunal; and, for the sake of the dead, an occasion of offence ought not to be placed in the way of the living.—III. No individual man should attempt to procure for his writings, by the subscriptions of many, that authority which the catholic church conceded only to the holy scriptures. No such fetters ought to be imposed on the judgment of church-teachers: it should be left free for each to determine, with regard to the dictum of an individual, what he

* This Ferrandus is also known to us through his work entitled *Christian Rules of Life* (*qualis esse debeat dux religiosus in actibus militaribus*), written for the Comes Reginus, who probably filled the post of governor of North Africa. In this production he shows himself to be a man quite zealous and alive for practical Christianity, actuated by a warm philanthropy, and as fearlessly independent as he was prudent and sensible. He warned the count against the tricks whereby the governors of this period contrived to gain the emperor's favour, deceiving him with regard to the lamentable condition of the provinces, and finally bringing the latter to the very verge of ruin. He gives the count the following seven rules, which he goes on to unfold and explain: I. *Gratiæ Dei adjutorium tibi necessarium per singulos actus crede.* II. *Vita tua speculum sit, ubi milites tui videant, quid agere debent.* III. *Non præesse appetas; sed prodesse.* IV. *Dilige rempublicam sicut te ipsum.* V. *Humanis divina præpone.* VI. *Noli esse multum justus.* VII. *Memento te esse Christianum.*

† Facund. Hermian. l. IV. c. 3.

felt obliged to approve, and what to condemn. Men should not bind themselves by such subscriptions, if they would leave themselves any opportunity of correcting their judgment afterwards on a clearer manifestation of the truth.* Vigilius appeared resolved at first to follow the principles here expressed; but the emperor hoped still to overcome his scruples, by means which his absolute sovereignty put within his power; and, as it was so very important to make sure of the voice of the Roman bishop, he sent for him to come to Constantinople. He admonished him, with the patriarchs and other bishops, to study for that peace which Christ loved more than all sacrifices. But Vigilius did not seem inclined to follow this admonition, in the sense in which the emperor intended it; for, while on his journey, he wrote to the patriarch Mennas, that the peace of Christ was a different thing from the peace of the world.† After his arrival at Constantinople, A.D. 547, he bore himself at first according to the same spirit. He gave notice to the patriarch Mennas, and all the bishops who had concurred in the condemnation of the three articles, of his intention to withdraw from the fellowship of the church.‡ But his firmness did not last long. He suffered himself to be drawn, in the first place, into a secret written declaration, condemning the three articles.§ Through Vigilius, the emperor now sought to work upon a synod assembled at Constantinople; and the Roman bishop himself was anxious to give his first public declarations, in this way, a more advantageous appearance, and, by issuing them in fellowship with the large body of bishops, to secure himself from the reproaches which he had reason to apprehend. But owing to the energetic resistance of the North-African bishops, especially of Facundus of Hermiane, this hope was defeated. Vigilius having failed

* A noble protest in favour of freedom of theological inquiry against an effort of this sort to fetter the universal judgment; *Patienter ferat pius scriptor sollicitudinem piam requirementum veritatem, nec festinet auditorum tenere manum; sed per suavem sensum paratus meliora sentientibus consentire.* L. c. c. 8.

† Lib. contra Mocianum, 594, A.

‡ Contra Mocian. 594, D. Theophanes, in the twentieth year of Justinian's reign, but where things which happened at different times are confounded.

§ Occulta ejus ante judicium pollicitatio tenebatur, in qua se spopondit eadem capitula damnaturum, c. Mocian. 592, D.

of his purpose in the *assembly* of bishops, he made the experiment of negotiating with them individually; and in this way he was more successful. He contrived to bring it about, that his first public declaration, his so-called *judicatum*, appeared with the signature of seventy bishops;* but this step provoked against himself a serious opposition. Even the two deacons who accompanied him, Rusticus and Sebastian, ventured to stand against him; and they took care that the *judicatum* of Vigilius should speedily be spread far and wide. They accused him of having detracted from the authority of the Chalcedonian council; they were not afraid even to renounce church-fellowship with him, and a party of the clergy took sides with them. Vigilius, it is true, in a letter describing their conduct, and full of invectives, pronounced on them sentence of deposition;† but he had against him the public opinion of the Western church. The free-minded voices of the North-African bishops would here have great influence.

Among these is to be named especially the bishop Facundus of Hermiane. Having first entered into a thorough investigation of the questions in dispute, he came to a decision, and ever afterwards abode with unshaken constancy by the result at which he had arrived with clear conviction. In defence of it he wrote a treatise eminently characterized by qualities seldom to be met with in this age,—a freedom of spirit unshackled by human fear, and a candid, thorough criticism, superior in many respects to the prejudices of the times.‡ Nobly did he protest against the uncalled-for dogmatism which had ever been the source of so much mischief to the Greek church: these useless disputes having in fact proceeded from no other cause. “While,” he said, “in all other arts and occupations, no one presumed to pass judgment on what he had never learned; in matters of theology, on the contrary, they who learned the least were the most arrogant and peremptory in their judgments.§ When the civil power over-

* Contra Mocian. 593, c. and the preface to the work of Facundus pro defens. trium capitulor.

† See epistola ad Rusticum et Sebastianum. Harduin. Concil. T. iii. f. 176.

‡ Pro defensione trium capitulorum libri XII.

§ L. XII. c. 4. Nam et suas habent officinas vel artifices omnia quæ ex proposito doceri videmus. Nunquam enim de textino personare

stepped its province, it might indeed plunge numbers in ruin, by misleading them to deny the truth with their lips; but still it could never effect its object, for it could not instil into the minds of men other convictions than they had: its power reached only to what was outward, not to the soul.”* He spoke with scorn of those bishops who accused themselves in pleading, in excuse of their behaviour, the constraint under which they were placed: for it was not even the force of torture, but only the fear of the emperor’s displeasure, which had brought them to yield.† “As if,” said he, “we had been ordained bishops for no other purpose than to be enriched by the presents of princes, and to sit with them among the high authorities of the state. But if, amidst the many cares of the state, through the deceitful arts of the wicked, of which there is never any lack, anything has been admitted by them which tended to injure the church or to disturb its peace, as if it were not our duty to set before them the truth for their own benefit, and, if it be necessary, to resist them with the authority of religion, and patiently endure their displeasure if we must incur it.‡ If God should now raise up an Ambrose,” said he, “there would not fail to be a Theodosius.”§

incudes audivimus et ignem illic in fornacibus anhelare. Nunquam comperimus a sutore quæsitum quæ ejusque fabricæ longitudini proportio latitudinis conveniret et quanta utriusque congrueret altitudo, quoniam illi integre scire possunt, qui ab ipsius artis sunt præceptoribus instituti. Solæ in contemptu sunt divinæ literæ, quæ nec suam scholam nec magistros habent, et de quibus peritissime disputare se credat qui nunquam didicit.

* *Etsi vocem contradictionis abstulerit, animum certe mutare non potuit. Aliquos jus mundanæ potestatis ecclesiæ valet auferre, nullum tamen sibi acquirere.*

† *Against the excuse of Vigilius: Nos contra respondimus, quod ultro per ambitionem pollicitatione facta peccaverit, nec ulla sustinuerit tormenta, quibus cessisse credatur. Contra Mocian. f. 595.*

‡ *Quasi vero propter hoc tantum ordinati sumus episcopi, ut ditemur principum donis, et cum eis inter maximas potestates consedeamus, tanquam divini sacerdotii privilegiis fulti: sicubi autem fallaciis malignorum, quæ nullis temporibus defuerunt, aliquid eis inter tantas reipublicæ suæ curas subreptum fuerit, quod ecclesiæ Dei præjudicet vel ecclesiæ pacem turbet, non eis debeamus pro ipsorum solute quæ sunt vera suggerere, et si necesse fuerit, religionis auctoritate resistere, ac patientes offensionem quoque illorum, si acciderit, sustinere. L. IV. c. 4.*

§ *Si nunc Deus aliquem Ambrosium suscicaret, etiam Theodosius non deesset. L. XII. f. 584, D.*

Although Vigilius reprimanded his antagonists with a tone of authority, yet he was not so firm as he wished to appear. The examples of the North-African and Illyrian bishops must have given him some sensations of shame. The North Africans had formally excommunicated him by a synodal decree, reserving to him nothing but the penance of the church.* The general voice of the Western church, which accused him of betraying the church out of regard for men, was by no means a matter of indifference to him. He wished to take back with a good grace what he had declared and sworn in so many different ways. To open the way for this, he importuned the emperor that he would cause the decision of the matter to be referred to a general council, which the Western bishops also should attend. In the midst of a large multitude, the individual, forsooth, would have less to fear. Nor was the emperor by any means disinclined to this measure; for he could not but welcome the opportunity which such an assembly would afford him of putting down, by an overwhelming church authority, the opposition to the condemnation of the three articles; and the more, as religious agitations might bring on a political ferment dangerous to the unsettled state of his newly-founded Western empire. Now, as a general council would pass a decision of so much greater weight, Vigilius prevailed on the emperor to give up to him for the present his own *judicatum*. Justinian was resolved, however, that his edict against the three articles should not fail, and that he would use the council only as an instrument for its confirmation and execution; but as he had no great confidence perhaps in the fickle-minded Vigilius, he determined to make sure of him by putting him under an oath. And Vigilius was pusillanimous enough to take such an oath as the emperor was pleased to dictate,—an oath by which he bound himself to the degradation of acting as the emperor's blind instrument and secret spy. He promised in it, that, heart and hand with the emperor, he would do all in his power to carry through the condemnation of the three articles. In defence of them he would neither directly nor indirectly do or say anything, nor enter into any secret councils. And should any

* See the Chronicle of the African bishop Victor of Tununum. *Canisii lectiones antiquæ*, ed. Basnage, T. I. f. 332.

individual propose to him anything that conflicted with these decisions, anything that concerned the three articles or the faith, or that was contrary to the interests of the state, he would make the individual known to the emperor, as well as all that he said, on condition, however, that the emperor should not attempt the life of any such person, and, out of regard for the honour of his sacred office, that he should not betray the informer. He was quite sensible, then, in what sort of light he must appear, as a Roman bi-hop, playing such a part.* The emperor, having, as he supposed, made sure of Vigilius, summoned, in 551, the bishops from Illyria and from North Africa, to a council to be held at Constantinople. The former did not attend, as they perfectly understood the object in view, and were resolved to have nothing to do with it. A part of the African bishops complied with the summons. The emperor endeavoured to move them by bribes, by friendly words, and by threats. Several stood out firmly against his arbitrary will; and these suffered violent persecutions, partly under the false charge of political offences. Among these latter was the bishop Reparatus, of Carthage, who was deposed from his office and condemned to exile; and his chief agent (Apocrisarius), the deacon Primasius, obtained, as his reward for condemning the three articles, the *privilege* of being thrust as their bishop on the unwilling church of Carthage.† Not without tumults and bloodshed‡ the churches in North Africa were deprived of their beloved bishops; while others were sub-tituted in their place, who consented to serve as the slaves of the court. The

* The words of Vigilius, taken from the form of the oath, published first by Baluz, are: *Et si quis mihi aliquid contrarium dixerit aut de istis capitulis, aut de fide aut contra rem publicam, istum sine mortis periculo pietati vestræ manifestabo et quæ mihi locutus est, ita ut propter locum meum personam meam non prodas.* Mansi Concil. T. IX. f. 364.

† This Primasius should not be confounded with another Primasius, bishop of the city of Adiumetum in Buzazene, who was at first steadfast, but afterwards consented to take a bribe. Perhaps this latter is the same person who is the author of the commentary on the epistles of Paul and on the Revelation.

‡ Procopius says of the emperor Justinian, of whom, in general, he judges more correctly than the Greek historians of this time: *Εἰς μίαν ἄμφω τῷ Χριστῷ δόξαν ἅπαντας ἐν σπουδῇ ἔχων, λόγῳ οὐδένι τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους διφθεῖρει, οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἐδόκει φόβος ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, ἢν γὰρ μὴ τῆς αὐτοῦ δούλης οἱ τελευταῖντες τυχοῖν ὄντες.* Hist. arcan. c. 13.

governor of this province made search for all those bishops, of whom it might be expected that, owing to their character, or to their want of an independent theological judgment of their own, they might be easily led, and sent them to Constantinople, to add by their presence to the number of those who condemned the three articles.*

When Justinian found it impossible to do as he wished with the bishops of Illyria, Dalmatia, and North Africa, he next proceeded to urge the bishop Vigilius to unite with the obedient Greeks in condemning the three articles. Disregarding his remonstrances, he issued a new edict still more full in its details, which wore the appearance rather of a doctrinal treatise than of an imperial decree. This, as it would appear, contained a justification of the sentence against Theodore; and hence a number of pretended blasphemous expressions were cited from his works, and many of the passages chosen for this purpose only betrayed the exceedingly narrow mind of the inquisitorial judge. At the same time he defended himself against the reproach, that such a sentence tended to impair the authority of the council of Chalcedon; and he now supposed that he had deprived the Monophysites of all reasonable excuse for remaining separated from the dominant church. This edict Vigilius was required to subscribe, but the example of the North-African and Illyrian bishops had given him courage. He sent to demand of the emperor that he should revoke his edict; he ought to wait for the common decision of the bishops, and either cause the Western bishops, who had taken offence at what had hitherto been done, to attend the assembly in person, or else permit them freely to give in their written opinions. He threatened all who should receive the imperial edict, with excommunication. Such downright contradiction was more than the despotic Justinian could bear. Vigilius was obliged, in August 551, to take refuge from the wrath of the emperor in a church.† An imperial officer with an armed force attempting to remove him from that place, he fled to the altar, to which he clung so firmly,

* See the narratives of the bishop Victor of Tununum, who was himself obliged to suffer exile, imprisonment, and bodily ill-treatment, as a defender of the three articles; and the report of the Roman clergy to the Frankish envoys.

† *Beati Petri basilica in Ormisda.*

that, it came near being overturned with himself to the ground.*

The emperor having at length promised him safety upon his word and oath, he returned to his usual residence, where, however, he was treated like a prisoner. Disgusted at this confinement, he escaped during the night, two days before the Christmas festival, not without considerable danger, and took refuge in the church of St. Euphema, at Chalcedon. When the emperor invited him once more, by an honourable embassy, to leave this asylum, and promised to give him the most sacred pledges of personal security, Vigilius sent back the reply, that no further sacred pledges were needed, if he would but restore back to the church the peace it enjoyed under his uncle Justinus. But the emperor, who wished and hoped for the co-operation of Vigilius in carrying out his designs on the council, entered into a new train of negotiations with him, and at length succeeded in persuading him to leave the church.

From seven to eight years having now passed amidst these unfruitful controversies, which, destitute of all doctrinal interest, proceeded solely from the intrigues of court-parties and from the arbitrary will of an individual (the Roman bishop having been now detained six years to no purpose at Constantinople), it was finally determined that a general council for the determination of this dispute should be assembled at Constantinople, in the year 553, under the patriarch Eutychius †—a great undertaking for an object which, measured

* In his letter of complaint ad universum populum Dei: Et super nos etiam ipsa altaris mensa ceciderat, nisi clericorum nostrorum fuisset manibus sustentata. Theophaues chronograph. Ἐκείθεν ἐλκόμενος κατεσχιστοὺς βασταζόντας τὸ θυσιαστήριον κίονας, καὶ τοὺτους κατίστρεψεν βαρὺς ὢν.

† This Eutychius, general superintendent (Καθολικός) of all the monks in the metropolitan church of Amosea in Pontus, had just at that time been sent to Constantinople by his bishop, as his representative at the council, when the old patriarch Mennas died there. By his zeal (perhaps on his part, with his narrow views, honestly meant) against the heresies of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and for the condemnation of the three articles, he gained the particular favour of the emperor. Among other things, it is said that Justinian—which accords well with his taste—was highly gratified when Eutychius, in answer to those who would not allow that it was permitted to anathematize the dead, affirmed it as a certain truth, that men were both warranted and in duty bound to pronounce the anathema on heretics even after their death; for king Josiah had caused the very bones of the priests of Baal to be burned after their

by its intrinsic importance, was so comparatively insignificant. When Vigilus was invited to take part in this council, he declined; but declared himself ready, within the space of twenty days, to hand in his written judgment on the whole matter; and, in case he did not fulfil his engagement within that term, to accede to all the decrees of the council. The latter accordingly proceeded to their business, independently, and without waiting for the decision of the Roman bishop. Vigilus fulfilled his promise, and published his decision in his *constitutum ad imperatorem*. In this he declared, indeed, that the propositions which had been taken from the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were heretical; but immediately subjoined, that it was never allowable to condemn, after his death, a teacher who had died in the communion of the Church. The writings, however, of Theodoret and of Ibas, having been approved by the council of Chalcedon, could not be rejected without impairing the authority of that council. Everything which might be done or written against this decision, from whomsoever it might come, he declared to be null and void. The emperor, who regarded himself to be the supreme lawgiver of the church, thereupon sent a letter to the assembled council, in which he declared that Vigilus had, by his defence of the erroneous doctrines of Nestorius and Theodore, and their companions, cut himself off from the fellowship of the church, and his name should therefore be expunged from the church records. He made a distinction, however, between the person of the individual Roman bishop and the apostolic see or the Roman church; the fellowship of the latter should thereby be in nowise affected. The council followed the emperor's orders, and decided according to the imperial edict. The anathema was pronounced on the person and the doctrines of Theodore as well as on the defenders of them; but with regard to Theodoret and Ibas, only on those particular writings, because both had afterwards recalled their erroneous doctrines, and accordingly had been acknowledged as orthodox by the Chalcedonian council. All who refused to submit to this judgment should, if they were ecclesiastics, be

death. (2 Chron. xxxiv.) Justinian rewarded his zeal by bestowing on him the patriarchate. See the account of the life of Eutychius, by the presbyter Eustratius, in the Greek, in *actis sanctorum*. Appendix to the vi. April, s. 22.

deposed from their places, and, if laymen, be excommunicated. Accordingly, several worthy bishops of Illyria and of North Africa, who did not yield to the ruling power, were deposed from their places and banished.

The strong desire to be released, and be permitted to return home to his bishopric, caused Vigilus again, and for the last time, to waver. He agreed finally to a new declaration, in which he retracted all he had written in defence of the three articles, and confirmed the decrees of the council at Constantinople. Upon this he obtained permission to return to Rome, but died on the journey, A.D. 555.

Thus, then, the arbitrary will of an emperor, governed by court intrigues, brought it about, that a great church-teacher, whose influence had been of no small weight on the development of theological doctrines, should be denounced as a heretic; while the fickle mind of a Roman bishop, whose instability of character made him the sport of circumstances, must triumph over the better spirit of the Western church.

But what was the result of these disputes? The project that hovered before the imagination of the emperor, of uniting the Monophysites with the dominant church, was not attained; for the authority of the council of Chalcedon, which was held fast by the majority, remained an abiding wall of separation between the two parties. And *in the Western church* arose a new schism, which continued to exist in the following times, as the effect of the condemnation pronounced by the council of Constantinople, and adopted by the Roman church. The churches of Istria, and all those which stood under the metropolitan of Aquileja, renounced, on this account, the fellowship of the Roman church.

As the emperor Justinian, in the matters of which we have thus far spoken, was made use of sometimes by this and sometimes by the other court-party, as an instrument of their intrigues, while he supposed himself to be zealously contending for the purity of doctrines; so towards the end of his reign, subservient to the same party passions, and legislating on matters which he did not understand,* he was upon the eve of calling forth new disastrous controversies in the Oriental

* Περικόπων μὲν τὰ μυστήρια, περίεργος δὲ ἄμφι τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ φύσει. So Procopius describes him, *hist. arcana*, c. 18.

church. A party among the Monophysites, who followed the doctrines of Xenayas and of the bishop Julian of Halicarnassus, derived, as a necessary consequence from the union of the Deity and humanity in one nature in Christ, the proposition, similar to one which had already been maintained by Clement of Alexandria and Hilary of Poitiers, that the body of Christ, even during his earthly life, was not subjected, by any necessity of nature,* to sensuous affections and wants, such as hunger, thirst, and pain; but that, by a free determination of his own will (*κατ' οἰκονομίαν*), he subjected himself to all these things for the salvation of man:—which view went under the name of *Aphthartodocetism*.

It is easy to see that this theory, seriously as the purely human element in Christ was thereby affected, would be agreeable to many, who were actuated by a misconceived desire of honouring Christ by depriving him of all human affections. And moreover, the adherents of the doctrine of the two natures might suppose, they could consider this as a consequence flowing from the union of the two natures in one person;—just as, on several other points, they agreed with the Monophysites,—namely, in approving the expressions, “God was born,” “God suffered,” and in denying all want of knowledge on the side of Christ’s human nature (or Agnoëtism, as it was called). Perhaps, at the same time, a secret court-party favouring the Monophysites, although their head, the empress Theodora, had long since died, had a hand in this matter. And certainly the enemies of the patriarch Eutychius of Constantinople could not have devised a better means to involve him in controversy, and perhaps indeed to bring upon him the whole displeasure of the emperor.† As the emperor Justinian was strongly inclined to favour the most extravagant expressions which caused the human attributes of Christ to be entirely forgotten in the divine; as he had already, while a minister of state under the preceding reign,

* All that was included in the conception of *φθόρα*, of the *παθήτων ὕψαι*, as a consequence of sin.

† The biographer of Eutychius accuses the Origenists especially of participating in these plots. This charge may indeed have arisen from the hatred of a heretical party: at the same time, however, Aphthartodocetism might easily be held in connection with the peculiar views of this party.

and afterwards at the beginning of his own reign, zealously defended the formula, which also was first brought into use by Monophysites,* “One of the Trinity suffered,” when it was introduced into the church by certain Scythian and Constantinopolitan monks (the so-called Theopaschites); as he had, in 533, confirmed this formula by an edict, and given himself no rest till it was adopted also in the Roman church; so now, in his advanced age, he thought he could do no greater work for the honour of Christ and the expurgation of his own sins, than, by a new edict, to make Aphthartodocetism a law. Already was it determined to force obedience to this edict after the usual manner; already had the patriarch Eutychius of Constantinople† been deposed and banished for contradicting it; already a similar fate was threatening Anastatius, the patriarch of Antioch; and partly a new disgraceful bondage, partly new inward distractions, were impending over the whole Oriental church, when, by the death of this emperor—which followed soon after—an emperor whose long reign had been the occasion of the greatest mischiefs in the Greek church, it was delivered, A.D. 565, from these new evils.

APPENDIX.

THE FORMATION OF SEPARATE CHURCH PARTIES, IN CONSEQUENCE OF THESE DISPUTES, BEYOND THE LIMITS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

WHILE the several church parties which grew up out of these controversies within the Roman empire had to yield to the sovereign power; in other lands, where a different religion from Christianity was the religion of the state, they were at full liberty to express and to propagate themselves; and the hostile relation in which they stood to the ruling church doc-

* As an addition to the Trisagion.

† Eutychius conducted himself with firmness and dignity: he persisted, even after a thrice-repeated summons, in protesting against the judgment of an illegal synod.

trine in the Roman empire contributed, in those countries, to render the government favourably disposed to them.

This was true, especially of the Nestorians. The most eminent seat, from which this sect extended itself in Persia, was a flourishing school for the education of Persian divines in the city of Edessa, in Mesopotamia. This city now became, immediately after the conclusion of the first Ephesian council, the theatre of the most violent disputes which grew out of the opposite views of doctrine which then agitated the church. The bishop of this city, whose name was Rabulas (see above), and who, before this, was on friendly terms with the other Syrian church-teachers, had, at a later period, attached himself wholly to the side of the patriarch Cyrill; and he associated himself with the most violent zealots against that which went under the name of Nestorianism, insomuch that he even ventured publicly to pronounce the anathema on those venerated teachers of the Syrian church, Diodorus and Theodore. He met with a determined resistance, however, from many of the clergy, and especially from the presbyter Ibas, a person who stood in high estimation, and to whom the teachers of the above-mentioned Persian school attached themselves. The latter were banished by the tyrannical Rabulas; and, by their means, first a tendency favourable to Nestorianism was introduced into Persia. Still more, however, did the presbyter Ibas himself, by his famous letter to the bishop Mares or Maris, of Hardaschir, in Persia, and by translating the works of Theodore and Diodorus into the Persian church language, which was the Syriac, contribute to diffuse, if not a predilection for Nestorius, yet an aversion to Cyrill, and a tendency of doctrine with which zeal for the tenets of Nestorius might easily be associated. In this letter to the bishop Maris he appears by no means as a friend of Nestorius. He says that this latter, as well as Cyrill, had given offence by his controversial writings. He blames him for having drawn down accusations on himself by his attack on the name θεότοκος, applied to Mary; as in truth all the moderate Orientals were agreed on this point with Ibas. But yet he spoke with more rancour against Cyrill, whom he accused of teaching the *oneness* of nature of the deity and humanity, and of falling into Apollinarianism.

When Ibas wrote this letter, the above-mentioned treaty of

coalition had been concluded betwixt Cyril and the Orientals. Ibas announced it with great triumph to his friend: he regarded the confession of faith laid down by the bishop Cyril as a recantation on his part,—as a token of the victory of pure doctrine, and of the universal restoration of tranquillity.*

Very soon, no doubt, he must see that he had been deceived in his expectations, as may be gathered from what has been related above; for he himself had in truth a great deal to suffer for a long time afterwards, until he was justified by the council of Chalcedon, from the enthusiasts for the doctrine of Cyril. In the meantime he became, in 435, the successor of Rabulas, as bishop of Edessa. By his means, probably, the seminary for Persian church-teachers was re-established, and it regained once more its former influence. The persecutions which Ibas afterwards had to suffer from the zealots of the opposite party, and the behaviour of this party, under the guidance of a Dioscurus, all this would of course be only suited to confirm the Persian Christians in their predilection for the oppressed party, to which they had attached themselves.

But the individual who contributed most to found and establish the Nestorian church in Persia, was Barsumas, one of those Persian teachers who had been driven away by the bishop Rabulas. His long and active labours, from 435 to 489, as bishop of the city of Nisibis, gave him the best opportunity for this. Although the accounts of later Jacobite historians, especially such as Abulpharagius and Barhebræus of the thirteenth century,† respecting the artifices he is said to have employed to determine the Persian king, Pherozes, in favour of his own party and against the dominant church of the Roman empire, do not appear to be altogether worthy of credit; yet there can at least be no doubt that political reasons must have moved the Persian kings to favour a separation of the Christians of their kingdom from the Christians of the Roman empire, and Barsumas doubtless might skilfully turn these reasons to the advantage of his own party.

When, in the year 496, Babæus, who was one of this party,

* The fragment of this letter is in the *Acta Concil. Chalc. act. X. Harduin. II. f. 530.*

† See especially the extracts from them, *Assemani, bibl. oriental. T. III. p. i. f. 391, &c.*

became, as patriarch of Seleucia, the head of the Persian church, he held a synod, by which the Nestorian church-party was completely organized. It became distinguished also from the rest of the oriental church, by allowing bishops and presbyters to marry.*

The Greek emperor Zeno broke up, it is true, in the year 489, the Persian seminary at Edessa, on account of its Nestorianism. The consequence of this, however, was the transfer of the school to Nisibis, where it could freely develop itself under the Persian government, and only flourished so much the more. From this school arose others among this church-party; and through many centuries it contributed to diffuse great enthusiasm for Christian knowledge and theological culture, and particularly for biblical studies, to which the spirit of a Theodore of Mopsuestia had given the incentives; and the Nestorian churches became an important instrument of diffusing Christianity in Eastern Asia.

The same was true also with regard to the propagation of the Monophysite party. In Egypt, the native country and proper home of this sect, it ever continued to exercise an important influence. But, when the emperor Justinian sought to enforce there, as elsewhere, the recognition of the authority of the council of Chalcedon, and to appoint those as bishops there who were devoted to the doctrinal system of that council, the Monophysites of this country renounced their connection with the dominant church, and maintained themselves as an independent sect, under their own patriarchs. Their party, after all that had transpired before, must have been the most numerous one. As the Egyptian church was the mother of the Ethiopian, this state of things would naturally have an influence also on the church in Ethiopia.

The Monophysite church developed itself with more freedom in Armenia. The persecutions waged against the Monophysites probably contributed to bring about the insurrection of the province of Greater Armenia, which facilitated the conquest of this country by the Persians. To the Persian ruler Chosroes, the separation of his new Christian subjects from the Christians of the Roman empire would, of course, be welcome, and he was desirous of confirming it. Under him, Nierses, the first bishop or catholicus of the Armenian church, held a synod

* Assemani III. 2, f. 79.

at Thriven, in 536, at which the Monophysite system was confirmed, and the anathema pronounced on the Chalcedonian council.

The credit of having done most to preserve, establish, and extend the Monophysite party in Syria and the adjacent countries, belongs to a man distinguished for indefatigable zeal in the cause to which he had devoted himself, for enterprising activity and a courage that despised all dangers. In those regions, owing to the deficiency of clergy, of which the emperor Justinian had found means to deprive them, the Monophysite party was threatened with becoming gradually extinct, when certain imprisoned bishops of this sect united together, and ordained, as the general metropolitan of their church, the monk and presbyter Jacob, from the cloister of Phasitla, in the district of Nisibis, a man inured to deprivations and hardships, and of unshaken firmness and constancy. With great rapidity, and not without many dangers, he traversed, under the disguise of a beggar,* the Syrian provinces and those adjacent; he confirmed, by his exhortations, the oppressed party, and ordained clergy for them; he gave them a superior in the patriarch of Antioch; and laboured for them himself during a period of thirty-three years, until A.D. 578, as a bishop, probably at Edessa. From him proceeded the name of Jacobites, which was applied sometimes to the whole sect, sometimes to a part of it only.

The peculiar bent of mind, however, in which the Monophysite system had originated, could not fail of soon becoming the source of internal divisions among themselves—that spirit which turned away from living Christianity, and would fain confine the essence of faith to these or the other dogmatic formulas. The doctrine of the one nature of Christ, for the sake of which they had separated from the dominant church, still contained matter enough for dialectical disputes; and the differences which now began to be discussed among themselves, showed how completely, notwithstanding the controversy had originally a deeper foundation, men had finally lost themselves in wilful disputes about terms and phrases, without any disposition to understand one another in respect to the conceptions

* From this circumstance, it is said, he received the surname Al Baradai—Baradæus, the man in rags.

attached to them. Thus, in fact, it came about, that amidst these controversies, many among the Monophysite party agreed in their doctrinal views with the adherents of the Chalcedonian council, except that they always substituted, instead of two natures in one person, one nature in one person. Thus the party of Severus, at Alexandria, maintained that deity and humanity, although united in one nature, yet retained unaltered the attributes corresponding to their proper essence; and they agreed, therefore, in this respect, with the doctrinal conceptions of the Chalcedonian council. Stephanus, surnamed Niobes (Νιόβης or Νιόβος), an Alexandrian rhetorician or sophist, found something inconsistent in this view, judged from the position of Monophysitism; and he became the founder of a distinct party, who were called Niobites.

This disputed question was extended to the spiritual and corporeal attributes of Christ's humanity. Severus maintained, conformably to his principles, and agreeing in this respect with the Duophysites, the doctrine of Phthartodocetism in opposition to Julian of Ilicarnassus. Themistius, a deacon at Alexandria, who belonged to the party of Severus, in applying this principle to the soul of Christ, fell, in truth, into the same species of *Agnostism*, which had already been denounced as heresy in Theodore of Mopsuestia.

By the controversies of the Monophysites with the theologians of the dominant church, the study of dialectics was greatly promoted in their theological schools; and this study found abundant nourishment in the works of Aristotle, who, still earlier than this, had by many been united with, or even preferred before Plato.* Dialectical acuteness was thus excited; and it is only to be lamented that it should have been, for the most part, wasted upon such unprofitable investigations, and could only move within the contracted circle of the church system of doctrine then in vogue. Yet trained in the midst of this sect were two men, eminently distinguished for freedom

* As early as the end of the fourth century, Libanius, in speaking of such as had come from the schools of Athens, mentions, in connection with the cloak, not the Academy and Plato, but the Lyceum and Aristotle. See Libanius' Discourse Περὶ τοῦς εἰς τὴν παιδείαν αὐτὸν ἀποσκαψάντας. Vol. III. ed. Reiske, p. 438. So in fact the Armenian David, who was educated at Athens, introduced the study of Aristotle into Armenia, near the close of the fifth century. See *Mémoires sur la vie et les ouvrages de David*, par C. F. Neumann. Paris, 1829.

and originality of mind. One of them, the learned and acute John, surnamed, on account of his literary activity, the laborious (ὁ φιλόπονος), lived in the last times of the sixth, and the beginning of the seventh century. He was an Apologist,* and a zealous polemical divine.† While he was intending to attack, with his Aristotelian dialectics, the adherents of the Chalcedonian council, and was thereby led to employ the conceptual determinations of Aristotle, after a very inadequate manner, in explaining and unfolding the doctrine of the Trinity, as, it is said, had been done already by Ascanius, a learned Monophysite, at Constantinople, he drew upon himself the charge of heresy from the side of his own party. He was wishing, namely, to show his opponents, that; if they taught the doctrine of two natures in Christ, they must necessarily suppose also two hypostases. To make this out, he distinguished, as an Aristotelian, the twofold employment of the term *nature* (φύσις). By this was understood either the universal conception of the kind (the εἶδος ἐνυπόστατον), or nature in the concrete, the individual beings in which the universal was expressed and coined into particular existence (the ἰδιοσύστατος τῆς φύσεως ὑπαρξίς, the ἄτομα). Now, when men spoke of two natures in Christ, they certainly did not understand, by the divine nature, the common divine essence, but the divine Logos, one of the three hypostases, in which the community of the divine nature, as of the divine essence, was contained. Even in speaking of a human nature, the human nature in general was not here meant; else it would be necessary to say, that the Logos united himself with all the men who ever had lived or who ever would live, for all these certainly belonged to the universal conception of the kind; but an altogether determinate human nature was meant, with which alone, among all, the Logos united himself in this manner. It was plain, therefore, that in this employment of it, the term φύσις was perfectly identical with the term ὑπόστασις,

* He wrote against Proclus and Jamblichus. Against the work of the latter, in defence of image worship. Photius (see Cod. 215) was not entirely satisfied with this work. Did Philoponus perhaps express himself on this occasion against images after the same manner as the Monophysite Xenayas?

† In his commentary on the History of the Creation, he attacked with the Aristotelian logic, particularly, Theodore of Mopsuestia.

and that accordingly, in supposing two natures, it would be necessary to suppose also two hypostases in Christ.* Now, by fixing upon such comparisons as these, which Philoponus employed, his enemies might, not without plausible grounds, accuse him of making the conception of the divine essence a mere conception of the kind, and of thus falling into Tritheism. To the very same result came the school-man, Gilbert of Poitiers, in the twelfth century, by a like employment of Aristotelian formulas.

The second of these men, Stephanus Gobarus (Στέφανος ὁ γοβαρούς), belongs also to the party founded by Philoponus. We know, it is true, of but one book under his name, from the list of its contents by Photius;† but this suffices to signalize him as a man of rare freedom of spirit for these times. While others aimed, for the most part, simply to point out the common church tradition in the teachings of the ancient church, and while the differences among them were willingly kept out of view; this man, on the contrary, ventured to bring together the opposite affirmative and negative decisions of the ancient church-teachers on doctrinal and exegetical questions, in some cases on important points, under twenty-five heads; and among these were to be found several expressions of venerated fathers of the church, which at that time might well appear offensive. Certain it could not have been his object in this, to exalt the authority of the church tradition.

As it was frequently the case, that in opposition to, or alongside of, the dialectic bent, a mystical tendency developed itself in theology, so it happened also among the Monophysites. A cloister at Edessa,‡ in Mesopotamia, had for its head, in the last times of the fifth century, an abbot by the name of Bar Sudaïli, who had busied himself in various ways with that mystic theology which always formed one of the ground-tendencies of the Oriental Monachism, and from which had proceeded the writings fabricated in the name of Dionysius the Areopagite; as in fact he appeals to the writings of a certain

* See the interesting fragment from the polemical work which Philoponus wrote, entitled *ὁ διαιτήτης*, the arbitrator, in Joannes Damascenus de hæresibus.

† Cod. 232.

‡ From these districts came also the Euchites (see vol. III. page 341), in whose mysticism a good deal of a kindred character may be found.

Hierotheos, whom the Pseudo-Dionysius calls his teacher.* He stood at first on intimate terms with the most eminent Monophysite teachers, and was very highly esteemed by them. But, as his mystic theology came into conflict with the church doctrine, he drew upon himself the most violent attacks. Espousing the peculiar views of Monophysitism, and more particularly as they were apprehended by the party of Xenayas, he maintained, that as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are one divine essence, and as the humanity formed one nature with the godhead in Christ, and his body became of like essence to the divinity (was deified), so through him all fallen beings should also be exalted to unity with God, in this way would become one with God; so that God, as Paul expresses it, should be all in all.

If it is true, as it is related,† that on the walls of his cell were found written the words, "All creatures are of the same essence with God;" we must suppose that he extended this assertion so as to include not only all rational beings, but all creatures of every kind, and that his theory was—as all existence proceeded by an original emanation from God, so by redemption all existence, once more refined and ennobled, would return back to him. But the question then arises, whether he understood this, after the pantheistic manner, as a return to the divine essence with the loss of all self-subsistent, individual existence (as it has often been observed, that mysticism runs into pantheism); or whether he supposed that, with

* In the Pseudo-Dionysian writings cited by him there were *θεολογικαὶ στοιχειώσεις* (ground-works of theology), and *ἐρωτικοὶ ὕμνοι* (alluding to love in the sense of the mystics). Abulpharagius (in Assemani B. O. T. II. f. 291) says that Bar Sudaili fabricated a book under the name of this Hierotheus, in confirmation of his own peculiar opinions; but he adds himself, that by many it was held to be a work of Hierotheus. It is probably therefore a mere conjecture of this Monophysite author, that Bar Sudaili was the writer of that book. It might possibly be that Bar Sudaili found an older apocryphal book, under this name, among the monks, and used it in support of his doctrines.

† This, however, may perhaps have been an invention of his enemies; since in fact they also affirmed, as the inscription was no longer to be found in his cell, he had erased it, when the thing began to be noised abroad. The same opinion is said to have been expressed in his books, only in a more concealed manner; but it may be a question, whether men did not *imply* in these writings a sense foreign to their true contents, from hostile feelings or from misconception.

the coming into existence of finite beings, sin also necessarily made its appearance, but that by the redemption this contrariety was removed, and now at length the individual existence of the creature should continue to subsist, as such, in union with God. Our information is too scanty to enable us to decide this question.* As a transition-point to that universal restoration, he supposed a millennial kingdom of exalted happiness on earth at the close of the earthly course of the world. That he entertained the same sensual notions respecting this millennial reign as the older Chiliasts, we cannot assume to be proved by the accusations of his opponents without the addition of more decisive testimony. This would not be consistent, at least, with his mystic theology; and his mystical expressions might easily be misconstrued by those who considered them in a hostile spirit. But neither are we warranted to pronounce the charge utterly false; for combinations of a mystical and a sensuous tendency admit of being psychologically explained, and are not without example. Like the older Chiliasts, Bar Sudaili taught that the Sabbath of that millennial period of rest, the Sunday, answered to the commencement of a new, higher, eternal order of world, after the universal restoration. By means of a mystical interpretation of the Bible, he sought to introduce his doctrines into the sacred scriptures, and for this purpose wrote commentaries on the Psalms. He boasted of higher revelations, whereby the more profound sense of scripture had been laid open to him. He called the sacred scriptures dreams, and his own expositions the interpretation of dreams. It was assuredly not his intention by this to disparage the authority of the Bible, but only, after the usual manner of the Theosophists, to mark their obscurity for ordinary men. The Bible contained nothing but hints, intimations of higher mysteries, and hence could be understood only by those to whom the Spirit communicated the intuitions of these mysteries. But when this person was accused of having declared all sacraments to be superfluous, as well as all moral discipline, of having taught that each individual might live according to his own sinful lusts; it is evident, from the way in which these charges are

* See the letter of the Monophysite bishop Xenayas to Abraham and Orestes, presbyters of Edessa in Assemani. T. II. f. 30.

laid, that they proceeded solely from an unjust fabrication of consequences. Because Bar Sudaili taught the destiny of all would at length be the same by reason of the universal restoration; it was inferred that, according to this doctrine, then, nothing at all depended on the different conduct of men, and each individual who continued to live in his sins would nevertheless share at last in the same blessedness with all the others; but Bar Sudaili would certainly have been far from admitting the correctness of these inferences.

C.—*Anthropology.*

From that part of the Christian system of faith which, as we remarked in the introduction to this section, received its first shaping in the Oriental church, conformably to its predominant speculative tendency, from theology in the more restricted sense of the term, we pass next to Anthropology, with the development of which, amid the contrariety of views there appearing, the Western church particularly busied itself. We noticed already, in the preceding period, the germs of opposite tendencies in the mode of apprehending the doctrines connected with this subject; from these germs, unfolded to more decided and strongly marked opposition to one another, the controversies of this period proceeded. As the central doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of the redemption, in opposing itself to the delusive notion of a moral self-sufficiency, presupposes, on the one hand, the sense of moral insufficiency, of an inward schism, and the feeling thence resulting of the need of redemption; on the other hand, the sense of moral freedom, which imputes to itself guilt, and appropriates the offered redemption—as Christianity announces itself, on the one hand, as a new transforming moral creation, as a new element of life changing and ennobling the entire human nature, and, on the other, attaches itself to the kindred moral nature of man, purifies this from all that is foreign, and takes it up into itself, in order to a free, harmonious development of its individuality of character—so the relation of Christianity to human nature could make its appearance in the dogmatic consciousness sometimes more on one of these sides, and sometimes more on the other. One of these particular modes of apprehension made its appearance in North Africa, through Tertullian; the other,

in the Alexandrian church, particularly through Clement and Origen; while yet the two modes of apprehension were still preserved in union with each other by the Christian consciousness lying at their root. One of these tendencies, then, continued, generally speaking, to be the predominant one in the Oriental, the other the predominant one in the Occidental church. The sense of corruption, the consequent feeling of the need of redemption in man's nature, of grace as a power for the moral transformation of the corrupt nature—this was particularly unfolded in the Western church; while, at the same time, however, the church still persisted in regarding the free moral self-determination as the condition presupposed by the inworking of this higher, divine principle. In the Oriental church, on the other hand, Christianity was also acknowledged, it is true, as a divine communication of life, transcending the limits of man's original nature: in Christianity there was acknowledged to be a higher divine creation; and, proceeding from the first sin, there was acknowledged to be a corruption of human nature, which must be cured by the redemption. It was regarded in particular as a consequence of the first sin, that human nature had become subjected to mortality, to sensuous defects and excitement, and to the manifold temptations of sin.* But although this view of the redemption as a remedy for existing evil was not repelled, yet the view of the redemption as a new glorious creation was made still more prominent. These two different modes of apprehension corresponded, in fact, to two different courses of culture pursued by the individual, according as the case was, that, either from a strongly pronounced consciousness of guilt, he came to the gospel out of a sudden great crisis of the inner life, or had unfolded himself by a more gradual and regulated progress within Christianity itself, appropriating human nature from the first stages of its development. In the Oriental church, it was simply held to be essential to affirm grace and free-will at the same time, without attempting exactly to define the relation of the two to each other; it was only sought carefully to avoid everything that might seem to favour arbitrary will on the part of God in the election of men,—an unconditioned prede-

* The *σῶμα θνητόν* and *ἡμιπαθὲς*, as contradistinguished from the earlier *ἀπαθὲς*.

termination, which might seem to impair the doctrine of the divine love and justice, and of man's free-will. To the mode of treating these doctrines in the Oriental church, we shall return again hereafter.

As examples to show how these doctrines were apprehended in the Western church, previous to the breaking-out of these disputes, we will lay open the systems of Hilary of Poitiers, and of Ambrose of Milan.

In considering the scheme of doctrine which prevailed among the Latins, it is important to notice, that, in their ancient translation of the New Testament, the words ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον (Rom. v. 12) were rendered, "in quo omnes peccaverunt." This furnished some apparent ground for the representation, that all mankind sinned in Adam; though we by no means intend to say that the above erroneous translation was the only ground on which such a doctrine reposed. The ground of it, doubtless, lay still deeper than that, in facts and enigmas of the moral self-consciousness—in the same which also presented a foothold for the various schemes of doctrine concerning the soul's pre-existence. At all events, however, this erroneous translation was the means of bringing it about, that the above representation of all mankind having sinned in Adam should be universally received as an undeniable foundation of doctrine. This proposition, Hilary of Poitiers makes his starting point, when, in commenting on Matt. xviii. 13, he understands by the ninety and nine sheep which went not astray, the angels, and by the one lost sheep, mankind; inasmuch as all humanity partook in the one sin of Adam.* As to the way in which this connection of the sin of Adam with the sin of mankind is to be conceived, it is a point which he explains no farther; but this much is clear, that from this he derived a sinful inclination cleaving to all men, as, for example, where he speaks of sins to which men are led by the bent of their nature.† Accordingly he says, that by baptism we are delivered from the sins of our birth, are separated from the propensities of our progenitors, and

* Commentar. in Matth. xviii. s. 6. Ovis una homo intelligendus est, et sub homine uno universitas sentienda est. Sed in unius Adæ errore omne hominum genus aberravit.

† Ad hæc nos vitia naturæ nostræ propellit instinctus. Tract. in Ps. i. s. 4.

lay aside the old man with his sins and his unbelief.*. *All* moral evil, however, Hilary seems to refer to the sensuous nature; while in the soul he recognizes the indestructible image of God.† Thus the contrariety betwixt the inner, and the outer man is to him no other than that betwixt spirit and sense.‡ To him all men appear standing in need of the forgiveness of sin, by reason of the moral defects which cleave to them. "The works of righteousness," says he, "would not be sufficient to deserve perfect blessedness, unless the mercy of God, in those cases where the will was bent on righteousness, also forbore to impute those faults which proceed from the fluctuation and inconstancy of the human passions."§ Human mutability, dependence on the inconstancy of the affections, preclude, according to Hilary, the possibility of perfect virtue. In comparison with God, no man can be called good. There is no perfect virtue but that which remains unchangeably the same. In man we can speak only of relative goodness: in single moments a man may be called good, either with reference to his intentions or to his actions; but this is not an abiding state with him—a view of the matter, we must allow, which proceeds from a somewhat superficial way of considering it, since in moral life the individual moment do not admit of being thus insulated from their connection with the whole. "Human passions," says he, "vary by alternation: thus, for example, by injuries man is irritated; by fear he is disturbed; by love he is differently affected; by hatred he is impelled, etc. But still, in the moments when our will or our act is a good one, it cannot be otherwise than that we should be what we are."|| The words

* In Matth. x. s. 24. Ab originis nostræ peccatis atque auctoribus separamur, a patris et matris affectionibus dissidemus, veterem cum peccatis atque infidelitate sua hominem exuentes.

† Thus he says of Job: Formatus intra matris vulvam et per virtutem Creatoris in substantia animæ ad Dei sui imaginem figuratus, eum qui ex incremento accessit profectum editi corporis congeniuit, in quo sibi in malis seculi et infirmitatibus carnis vitiisque vivendum sit. In Ps. cxix. s. 12.

‡ Cum interior homo spiritus opera desiderat, exterior voluptates corporis concupiscit. In Ps. cxxix. s. 6.

§ Non enim ipsa illa justitiæ opera sufficient ad perfectæ beatitudinis meritum, nisi misericordia Dei etiam in hoc justitiæ voluntate humanarum demutationum et motuum vitia non reputet. In Ps. li. s. 23.

|| Idcirco perfecta bonitas in nullo est, quia eam naturalium perturba-

of Christ, that he was not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance, he explains as follows:—Our Saviour would thereby have us to understand that as he was come in behalf of all, so all must see themselves to be sinners, in order to partake of the salvation which is through him.* So he says, "By faith, that is obtained which the law could not bring to pass; faith alone justifies."† But justification is manifestly to be understood here in the objective sense. According to this, then, we might suppose Hilary would have been unwilling to admit the possibility of a righteousness consisting in the fulfilment of the law. This, however, is not his opinion. We find here a want of clearness in respect to the conception of the law, which afterwards, as we shall see, presented a foothold for Pelagianism. Failing to distinguish the two different modes of apprehending the law, first according to its eternal, divine matter, its spirit and essence; and secondly, the law in its particular Mosaic form, in the outward statutes of this politico-theocratical constitution, the law expressed in commandments having reference to outward actions;—failing to distinguish and hold apart these two different applications of the conception, and having his mind fixed on the last-mentioned reference, he was enabled to distinguish the standing ground of a righteousness consisting in the fulfilment of the law, by which one might, even without any knowledge of Christ, attain to a certain stage of blessedness, and the standing ground of the higher righteousness by faith, which could be communicated only through Christ.‡ In proof of such a standing ground of righteousness by the law, he refers to the words of Paul (Rom. x. 5), in which, we

tionum incentiva demutant. Sed tamen, cum in bonitatis sumus vel voluntate vel gestis, non possumus vel tunc non hoc esse quod sumus. Et quamvis imperfecti ad id simus, nec semper id simus, quod tamen sumus in tempore licet per naturæ infirmitatem demutationi bonitatis obnoxii, non adimitur nobis bonos nos vel tum esse cum sumus. In Ps. lii. s. 11.

* *Omnibus venerat. Quomodo ergo non se justis venisse dicit? Erant ergo, quibus necesse non erat, ut veniret? Sed nemo justus ex lege est. Ostendit ergo, inanem justitiæ esse jactantiam. In Matth. ix. s. 2.*

† *Remissum est a Christo, quod lex laxare non poterat; fides enim sola justificat. In Matth. viii. s. 6.*

‡ *Nec ambiguum est, eos in viventium libro esse, qui antea sine ullo Christi cognitione pie in lege versati omnia præscripta legis impleverint. Scribuntur autem in libro justorum, quibus justitia Christus est factus. In Ps. lxxviii. s. 24.*

must allow, he applies a meaning altogether opposed to the thought of the apostle;* as if he intended to say that, on the standing ground of law, it would have been possible for man to really fulfil it by works, and thus attain to life. But this mistake grew out of his neglecting to distinguish the sense of the word according to the original connection in which it is employed in the Old Testament, and according to the application given to it by the apostle Paul. Over against the laborious and painful righteousness of the law, and the sin-burdened life of the world, he places the gentle yoke of Christ under which the practice of goodness is made easy by love; though in this case he fails rightly to explain how this is connected with, and grounded in, the peculiar principle of the new Christian life. "Those who painfully struggle along," says he, "under the difficulties of the law, and those who are burdened with the sins of the world, Christ calls to himself; and he promises to make their way easy and their burden light, if they will but take his yoke upon them, that is, subject themselves to his commands, and come to him under the holy sacrament of the cross; because he is meek and lowly of heart, and they shall therein (by submitting to his commands) find rest to their souls: holding out the allurements of an easy yoke and a light burden, that he may bestow on those who believe on him the knowledge of the true good. And what easier, what lighter burden is there than this; to take delight in abstaining from sin, in willing what is good, in loving all men, in hating none, in attaining to things eternal, in not being carried away by things present and temporal, in being unwilling to do to others what you would not choose to suffer yourself."† Now the only thing made prominent here

* In the passage just cited: *De quibus secundum legem apostolus Paulus ita docuit: quia qui fecerit ea, vivet in illis.*

† In *Matth. xi. s. 13.* *Legis deinde difficultatibus laborantes et peccatis seculi oneratos ad se advocat, demiturumque se laborem onusque promittit, si modo ejus jugum tollant, mandatorum scilicet suorum præcepta suscipiant, eumque sacramento crucis adeant, qui corde humilis et mitis sit, et in his animabus suis requiem inveniant; jugi suavis et levis oneris blandimenta proponens, ut credentibus ejus boni scientiam præstet, quod solus ipse novit in Patre. Et quid iugo ipsius suavius, quid onere levius, probabilem fieri, scelere abstinere, bonum velle, malum nolle, amare omnes, odisse nullum, æterna consequi, præsentibus non capi, nolle inferre alteri, quod ipsi sibi perpeti sit molestum?*

is the standing ground of a new and higher moral knowledge; yet, in addition to this, we must take from other passages the sense of the forgiveness of sin imparted by Christ; nor should we neglect to notice the sacramentum crucis, of which mention is here made. Moreover, he undoubtedly presupposes the communication through Christ of a new principle of divine life—which belongs to the essence of the *justitia fidei*,—to justification in the subjective sense; since he constantly admits the necessity of a co-operation of grace and free-will, in order to the vigorous growth of the Christian life.

Thus he says,* “As the organs of man’s body cannot exercise their activity unless certain other causes supervene, as, for example, the eye cannot see if there be no light, so the human soul ever possesses indeed the capacity of knowing God; but, unless it receives by faith the gift of the Holy Ghost, it will not attain to the light of that knowledge. Yet the gift of Christ is free for each man’s acceptance, and that which is denied to none is bestowed on each, just so far as he will receive it. The Holy Spirit is the light of the soul; but we must long after it, we must labour to participate in it, and then preserve it within us, by faithful obedience to the divine commands.”† “It is the extreme of folly and of impiety,” says he in another place,‡ “not to see clearly that we live in dependence on God, and derive everything from God, and, in whatever we undertake or expect, to rely chiefly on our own ability, when the truth is, that whoever has anything in himself can have it only from God. To God, then, must all our hopes be directed.” He considers it very important to set forth distinctly, that all the operations of divine grace are conditioned on man’s free-will,—to repel everything which might serve to favour the notion of a natural necessity, or of an unconditional divine predestination. He quotes Ps. lviii. 5, to prove that sin cannot be considered as anything innate, but must be referred to a guilty hardening of the will;§ for

* De trinitate, l. II. s. 35.

† Expetendus est, promerendus est, et deinceps præceptorum fide atque observatione retinendus. To the term *promereri*, according to the Latin usus loquendi of this period, the conception of merit, in the strict sense of the term, is not to be attached.

‡ In *ψ*. 51, s. 20.

§ In Ps. lvii. s. 3. Ne vitium referri posset ad originem, præduratæ in his ad obediendum voluntatis crimen exprobrat.

the godless man is here compared to a serpent that stops its ear to the voice of the charmer. Every day is the word of God held forth in opposition to the power of sin in man, to ward off and overcome it. They who hearken not to the voice of the gospel are therefore the generation of vipers.* Expounding the scriptures conformably with his doctrinal interest, he could find even in the passage, Rom. ix. 13, which is altogether at variance with his fundamental position, nothing else than a divine predestination conditioned on the foreknowledge of the bent of the human will.† For the rest, it may be gathered from what has been said, how much remained still vague and self-contradictory in the doctrine of Hilary. There was a necessity for new developments, and a more distinct presentation of oppositions hitherto concealed.

Ambrose may well be regarded as forming the intermediate link between the course of doctrinal development which had till now prevailed in the Western church, and the great man from whom a new epoch commences;—namely, Augustin. Ambrose expresses himself still more strongly than Hilary on the moral corruption of man, and its connection with the first sin. Thus he says:‡ “We all have sinned in the first man; and, with the propagation of the *nature*, the propagation of the *guilt* also has passed from one to all. In him, *human nature* sinned.” In one aspect, the corruption which passed from the first parent to all his posterity seems to be derived from the law of natural propagation; in another, a certain inherent connection seems to be supposed between the first member of the human race, as one in whom the whole kind was already contained in the germ, and all the later members of the race; as indeed Ambrose was already led to this view by the phrase “in quo” in the Latin version of Romans v. 12; which expression was referred to Adam.§ This idea was after-

* L. c. Cum ei (antiquo serpenti) quotidie ne fallat, ne subrepat, ne mordeat, etiam sub divini nominis denuntiatione mandetur, et tamen obstructo deservit auditu: ex quo non obedientes evangelio natio viperarum sunt.

† L. c. Sic Esau alienatus ab utero est, cum major minori serviturus, etiam antequam existeret, nuntiatur, Deo futuræ non nescio voluntatis, ipso potius hoc sciente, quam aliquo ad necessitatem genito naturamque peccati.

‡ Apologia David altera, s. 71.

§ Exposit. Evang. Lucæ, l. VII. p. 234. Potest et hic in uno accipi

wards more fully developed by the philosophical realism of Augustin. Yet Ambrose speaks, in other places, only of the personal guilt which each individual man has to bear,* and derives from the first sin nothing but the excitement to sin.† Concerning grace also, as the exciting and efficacious cause of all conversion, he declares himself still more strongly than Hilary; but he, too, supposes the operations of this grace are conditioned by human recipiency. “Redemption,” he says, “is given gratuitously, not according to the merit of works, but according to the free-will of the giver—according to the election of the Redeemer. Why did some of the Israelites attain thereunto, others not? The latter did not, because they were for justifying themselves; because they were proud of their works; because they did not believe, and would not acknowledge grace. The elect attained unto it because they heard Him who called them, received Him who came unto them. Since all do not desire to be healed, but the greatest number avoid it, he heals those who will suffer themselves to be healed, and forces no man against his will. The Lord calls the indolent, and awakens those who sleep. He who comes to the door and knocks, is willing only to enter; but it is our fault if he does not always enter—if he does not always abide with us. That true light shineth to all; but he who shuts his windows, robs himself of the light eternal.”‡ It is true, however, that, in two passages, Ambrose expresses himself in such a way as to refer all that is good in man solely to the agency of God as the operative cause, without mentioning the human self-determination as a necessary condition. When he says: “Christ brings it about, that that which is in and of itself good, appears to be good also to us; for he calls him on whom he has mercy. Accordingly, he who follows Christ, and is asked, why he will be a Christian, may reply: It so *appears* to me, that I must be one. And by so saying, he does not deny that God’s good pleasure has so ordered it; for it is by God the will of man is first excited, for

species generis humani. Fuit Adam, et in illo fuimus omnes. Periiit Adam, et in illo omnes perierunt.

* *ψ. 48, s. 9. In Die iudicii nostra in nobis, non alienæ iniquitatis flagitia punientur.*

† *The lubricum delinquendi.*

‡ See in *ψ. 43, s. 47; in ψ. 118, s. 13. De interpellat. David. l. IV. s. 4.*

that God is loved and adored by the saints is the effect of God's grace."*

This passage might, perhaps, be understood to mean that the human self-determination, the *mihi videtur*, is something free merely in appearance, but properly grounded in the determining act of the divine will, which determines all things.

This thought comes out still more strongly in the following words of Ambrose in the same work: "God calls those whom he deigns to call; whom he will, he makes religious."† Now, if we understand these passages, as meaning that a grace determining man's will with irresistible necessity is here supposed, then, inasmuch as this supposition contradicts the assertion of Ambrose above quoted, we must admit that conflicting elements entered into his view of the faith; as in fact such appearances sometimes manifest themselves at the point of transition from one stage of development to another; and as we might very naturally expect it would happen in the case of a man who was not an original and systematic divine, but spoke rather according to the momentary impulse of his feelings. But although the freedom of the divine election and the creative agency of grace are made particularly prominent in these passages, still they do not imply any necessary exclusion of the state of recipiency in the individual as a condition; and, accordingly, this assertion of Ambrose admits of being easily reconciled with the assertions first quoted.‡ In another place, at least, he expressly supposes that predestination is conditioned by foreknowledge.§

Thus it is evident, then, if we call to mind the relation of

* In Lucam, l. I. s. 10. Christus, ut id quod bonum est, nobis quoque videri bonum possit, operatur; quem enim miseratur, et vocat. Et ideo, qui Christum sequitur, potest interrogatus, cur esse voluerit Christianus, respondere: visum est mihi. Quod cum dicit, non negat, Deo visum, a Deo enim præparatur voluntas hominum. Ut enim Deus honorificetur a sancto, Dei gratia est.

† In Luc. VII. s. 27. Deus quos dignat, vocat, quos vult, religiosos facit.

‡ Augustin, in his work "de dono perseverantiæ," cites both these passages of Ambrose as testimonies in favour of the doctrine of grace working all. It may be, perhaps, that the mode of teaching pursued by Ambrose was not without its influence on him; but he was certainly not led by it to the doctrine of absolute predestination, for this doctrine did not unfold itself in his mind till a much later period. Besides, in the case of a man possessed of the intellect of Augustin, the power of such influence from abroad ought not to be overrated.

§ De fide, l. V. s. 83.

Ambrose to the Oriental church-teachers, the way, indeed, was already prepared for the appearance of the opposite moments in the mode of treating these doctrines. Yet the two churches, separated by difference of language, stood too remotely distant from each other to come to any mutual consciousness of this existing opposition, and to be led by it into a relation of mutual hostility. The opposition was destined to make its appearance in the Western church itself, and there to be evolved and presented in lines so well defined and strongly marked, that an open contest between the two opposite tendencies would be inevitable. This first took place when these tendencies, in such representatives of them respectively as Augustin and Pelagius, had unfolded themselves to such a degree of sharpness as mutually to exclude each other.

We must speak in the first place, therefore, of these two men; and we will begin with Augustin, because the development of his theological views on the points now under consideration was guided and determined by causes wholly within himself, and depended on no impulse derived from outward opposition; while, on the development of the system of Pelagius, a man possessed of a less original, a less speculative and systematizing spirit, the practical opposition to those doctrinal views which were akin to, or proceeded from, the mind of Augustin, had a great influence.

To the tendency which we have designated as the one peculiar to the Western church, and which we saw expressed particularly by Ambrose, Augustin was inclined by the peculiar course of education in which his whole life had been trained, and which we have already described.*

We have seen how it was only after a long and violent conflict with a fiery nature, but which struggled against the god-like in a wild feeling of power, that he attained to inward peace. Through many years tossed one side and the other, between the ideals which attracted the cravings of his spirit, and the desires and passions which held him chained to the pleasures of the world, he experienced in himself the conflict betwixt the spirit and the flesh. From his own inward experience he learned how to understand the fundamental ideas of the Christian, more particularly of the Pauline doctrine concerning man; and with the study of St. Paul's writings he

* See page 15 ff.

was, in fact, particularly occupied at the time when that great crisis occurred in his inner life. As he found those two great divisions in his own life,—the nature which, after all the efforts in his power, still remained impotent and struggled in vain for holiness, and the nature subordinated to faith, and victorious over sin through the power of redemption,—so he found once more the same two main divisions in the development of human nature as a whole. The opposition between that which proceeded from the nature left to itself and estranged from God, and that which came from the new and divine principle of life imparted to humanity by redemption and regeneration—this opposition, which he had learned from his own inward experience, came, from his life, to be the central point of his system of faith. As the opposites of good and evil in human nature presented themselves to the notice of Augustin from the first, it must have struck him as being the most difficult of all questions—Whence, in *that* human nature which feels itself attracted by the good, which is conscious of it as its original essence, whence the *evil* in it? This question occupied him the moment his thoughts were awakened on higher subjects. The meditation of this question conducted him to Manicheism, and with it was connected his renunciation of Manicheism. To Pelagius, on the other hand, this question would be attended with no difficulty at all. This became the central point for his thoughts, which strove after systematic connection and logical consistency. His systematizing mind, when it had once seized hold of a principle, was impelled to unfold and to apply it with the most rigid severity, not shrinking from any of the consequences to which it might lead.

But then we must distinguish different epochs and periods in Augustin's doctrinal progress, departing from which, and passing through which, he first attained to the last consistent development of the doctrinal principles which had flowed from that great crisis in his inner life.

The first period embraces the works which he wrote after his baptism until the first years of his entering upon the duties of a presbyter,—that is, until about the year 394,—his works, *de moribus ecclesiæ Catholicæ et Manichæorum*, *de vera religione*, and *de libero arbitrio*. In this period of his life, his Christian experience of the need man feels of help and of redemption, when he has become conscious of his moral evil,

and the consciousness that the communion of man with God once more restored by the redemption—that grace was the spring of everything truly good in man,—this experience and consciousness was united with the idea he had derived from Platonism, of the relation of all good with the primeval good, of all being with the Supreme and Absolute Being. The principle of grace and of resignation to God, as the original source of all good, was the common element between the first period and all the succeeding periods of his doctrinal progress; the groundwork from which everything in his case proceeded, and on which he framed his system with an ever-increasing consistency. But along with this tendency, there were at that time still other tendencies in his mind, which, at a later period, were, in part, suppressed by the entire and one-sided predominance of the main tendency above described. Very unjustly have Augustin's anthropological views been attributed to the influence of Manicheism. His doctrine concerning the moral corruption of human nature was something entirely different from the dualism of Mani's philosophy of nature; it grew not (as in the case of Mani) out of a confusion of the moral element with the intuition of nature, but out of a simple fact of the moral consciousness. Rather, it might be said that the consciousness, early awakened in his profound soul, of the irreconcilable opposition between good and evil, led him, while endeavouring to account to himself for this opposition in a speculative way, to Manicheism; but that the moral apprehension of this opposition, which forced itself with ever-increasing strength upon his mind, drew him away again from Manicheism. Again, from Platonism, and directly in opposition to Manicheism, his theory unfolded itself, that sin had not, as Manicheism taught, a self-subsistent existence of its own; but that, as all existence, all true being, sprung from the highest, the absolute, and is grounded in that, so evil is nothing other than just the subjective aberration of the created being from the law of the Supreme and only true Being; is, in and of itself, nothing, not being, the *μη ὄν*, but which, nevertheless, the moment it begins to act, must subject itself to the law of the highest being;* and to this point Augustin always firmly

* A defectus ab ordine, which yet must be subservient to the summus ordo. See especially the books de ordine.

adhered. Nor did he find any difficulty in bringing it into harmony with his later doctrine of absolute predestination. On the other hand, he united with it, in this period, another principle, by which this earlier period is essentially distinguished from the later.

He attached great importance, in this period, to the principle, that the above-mentioned subjective aberration from the supreme good could not be explained on any ground of natural necessity, but could only be derived from the free-will; and that the self-determining power of the free-will continued ever to be the ground of this aberration; that the cause of the diverse relations of men to the supreme good was ever to be traced only to the diverse bents of their free-will, which admitted of no farther explanation. The firm and steadfast adherence to the free-will as contradistinguished from natural necessity was, in this period, considered by him of the utmost importance. Beyond question, he also held fast to this point, at least in theory, in the later period; but it was only by a dialectic self-deception that he was enabled still to unite it, in reference to practical conduct, with the results of his later system.

The principles of Augustin, as they present themselves at this point of view, were as follows: In the condition in which man now finds himself, it is not in his power to be good; because he either does not know what he ought to be by his destination, or, if he knows it, is not able to live conformably to his known destination. Ignorance of the good, and the difficulty in practising it—these are the moral evils of human nature; and this would be inconsistent with God's justice, were it not a righteous punishment. Sin is its own punishment; so that, when man had the knowledge of good, and made no use of it, he thereby lost the knowledge; and when, possessing the faculty for good, he did not practise it, he lost thereby the faculty itself. If the question now presented itself, how does this hindrance to goodness, found cleaving to the moral nature of all men, admit of being reconciled with God's righteous judgment? He answered: Man could rightly complain, if no one had ever yet got the victory over the force of error and of passion; but the truth is, on the other hand, the means are supplied by which man may obtain the victory. God is everywhere present; and in manifold ways, by the

creatures who execute his will, calls after man, who has revolted from him, instructs the believing, strengthens and supports those who do what they can. Inculpable ignorance is not imputed to man as a sin; but this, that he does not strive after better knowledge. His moral imperfections are not reckoned to him as a crime; but he is justly culpable for the neglect of the means lying in his power. Augustin here supposed, then, the influences of divine grace, without which man could not be freed from his moral evil, to be invariably conditioned by the subjective bent of the free-will.

In a work composed about the year 394, entitled, "An Exposition of difficult passages in the Epistle to the Romans,"* the exposition of the difficult passage in the ninth chapter, which, at a later period, was especially employed by him to prove the doctrine of absolute predestination, afforded him an occasion for distinctly unfolding the connection of his ideas on this whole subject. He proceeds on the principle, that all men find themselves in a state of alienation from God, in which they can perfectly bring to pass nothing that is truly good. The love of God is the spring and fountain of all that is truly good; and to this, man can attain only by the communication of the Holy Spirit. As, then, he can accomplish nothing good before this renewal of his inner life by the Holy Spirit, so neither can he merit, by any kind of good works, the grace by which he is cured of his moral maladies: grace precedes all desert. But on this account, however, there is nothing like arbitrary will on the part of God, when he gives to some, and withholds from others, the grace by which men obtain salvation. Men obtain this grace by faith; and faith is wholly the work of man.† In the passage relating to the choice of Jacob and the rejection of Esau, he believed, therefore, that he found the contrary position to an election conditioned on good works, but not to an election conditioned on faith.‡ The Apostle Paul says—he remarks—God *works* all in all, but by no means God *believes* all in all. The hardening of Pharaoh, he explains as

* *Explicatio propositionum quarundam de epistola ad Romanos.*

† Sec. 60. Quod credimus, nostrum est. Quod autem bonum operamur, illius, qui credentibus in se dat Spiritum Sanctum.

‡ Non quidem Deus eligit opera, quæ ipse largitur cum dat Spiritum Sanctum, ut per caritatem bona operemur; sed tamen eligit fidem.

the fruit of his own guilt; the punishment of his previous unbelief, whereby his sin punished itself.

It is worth while to notice the way in which Augustin expressed himself respecting these matters on another occasion, namely, at the time when he was slowly progressing onward towards this last conclusion. In the collection of answers given by him to various questions proposed to him from the time of his return to North Africa, in the year 388, and onward,* (his work *de diversis quæstionibus octoginta tribus*,) the answer to the question relating to Rom. ix. 20, and what follows (Quæst. 68), probably belongs, as we may infer from the contents of the answer, to a somewhat later period.

Starting on the principle, that divine things can be understood only from the experience of faith, and in connection with a sanctified temper, he asserts that the apostle here by no means intends to restrain *the pious* from inquiring into these things, but only those who are not as yet sufficiently well-grounded in love, the earthly-minded, those who are for understanding God's counsels without being the children and friends of God. "Cleanse thyself from the old leaven," says he, "that thou mayst be a new dough; and that, in so being, thou mayst be no longer in the childhood of Christianity, so as to need milk to drink, but mayst reach the perfect age of manhood, and be one of those to whom it is said, We speak wisdom among those that are perfect. Then wilt thou discern, in the right way, and in the right order, the secrets of the Almighty concerning the most hidden deserts of souls†—concerning grace or justice." As it respects Pharaoh, he then remarks, the question may be easily answered. Through his earlier criminality, in oppressing the strangers in his kingdom, he deserved that his heart should be hardened, so that he could not be moved to believe, even by the most evident miracles of the commanding God. Beyond question, he has mercy on whom he will have mercy; and whom he will, he hardens. But this will cannot be an unjust one, since it proceeds on the most hidden relations of desert (is conditioned by them); for

* So the terminus a quo is fixed by himself. *Retract. lib. I. c. 26.*

† *De animarum occultissimis meritis*; which doubtless refers to the hidden inward character, ere it manifests itself in appearance—something which is known only to the divine foreknowledge, and hence conditions God's providential dealings with men.

though sinners, on the ground of universal sin, constitute one mass, yet there is a difference among them. There is in sinners, therefore, something that precedes, whereby, although not yet justified (that is, made just, sanctified), they are yet made worthy of justification.* That still remains true, which was spoken by the apostle (Rom. ix. 16), "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy." For although one who is oppressed with the lighter sins, or indeed with sins however great in magnitude and number, may, by bitter sighs, and many pains of repentance, become worthy of God's compassion, yet it is not his own work, since, left to himself, he would perish; but it must be ascribed to the mercy of God, who comes to the help of his prayers and his sorrows.† It is little to will, if God does not have mercy; but God does not have mercy unless the will has preceded. And since none can will, unless exhorted and called, (whether in the secret recesses of the soul, and in a way not seen by man, or from without by the word, or visible signs,) it follows by this, that the willing disposition itself is wrought in us by God.‡ Next he says: "But the calling which is made to individuals, or to single nations, or to the whole race in the right point of time, belongs to a high and profound order of things." To this he reckoned the passages in Jer. i. 5, Malachi i. 2 and 3. "And this can be comprehended perhaps by those only who love God with all the heart, and their neighbours as themselves. Yet this must be held fast with an unwavering faith, that God does nothing in the way of injustice, and that there is no being who is not indebted to God for all that he is." These words might, indeed, be understood as referring to the mystery of

* Sec. 2. Venit enim de occultissimis meritis, quia et ipsi peccatores, cum propter generale peccatum unam massam fecerint, non tamen nulla est inter illos diversitas. Præcedit ergo aliquid in peccatoribus, quo, quamvis nondum sit justificati, digni efficiantur justificatione, et item præcedit in aliis peccatoribus quo digni sunt obtusione.

† Sec. 5. Quia etiamsi levioribus quisque peccatis, aut certe quamvis gravioribus et multis, tamen magno gemitu et dolore penitendi, misericordia Dei dignus fuerit, non ipsius est, qui si relinqueretur, interiret, sed miserentis Dei, qui ejus precibus doloribusque subvenit.

‡ Et quoniam nec velle quisquam potest, nisi admonitus et vocatus, sive intrinsecus, ubi nullus hominum videt, sive extrinsecus per sermonem sonantem, aut per aliqua signa visibilia efficitur, ut etiam ipsum velle Deus operetur in nobis. L. c.

absolute predestination; so that Augustin was at that time still reluctant to express himself more openly; as, indeed, he seems to have explained this passage in his *Retractations*. Yet, when we take the words in connection with what has been said before, we certainly cannot doubt, that, at the time he wrote this, he did not so understand it, but rather had in his thoughts a foreknowledge conditioned on a foreknowledge of those *occultissima merita*.

In this scheme of Augustin, however, there was a great deal which, after a more full examination of all that was contained in his Christian consciousness, and a longer study of the sacred scriptures, must eventually appear untenable to a mind which so constantly strove after consistency and unity; for in proportion as he learned to place a higher value on the essence and dignity of faith,* in proportion as the one-sided idea of faith, which was first apprehended by him as a faith on authority, came to be gradually refined and transfigured into the idea of a living faith; in the same proportion it must become clear to him, that faith already presupposed the entrance of the divine life into the soul of man, that the divine and human elements had here already commingled, and that the two could not be set off from one another by any such strict line of demarcation. But, in perceiving this, he might easily run into the other extreme, of referring faith, like all the rest, solely to the divine agency, and wholly repressing the self determining activity of the man. Add to this, that the Theodicee which he had earlier attempted to construct on the ground-work of a predestination conditioned by foreknowledge,† could not satisfy his acute and sagacious mind, in its application to the calling of nations and the election of individuals, and the explanation, grounded thereupon, of the difficulties in the epistle to the

* See vol. III. sect. i. p. 142, 143.

† As, for example, that God's election of individuals and calling of nations was conditioned on his foreknowledge of the way in which they would be disposed towards his gospel, if it should be announced to them. See ep. 102 to Deogratias: Quibus omnino annuntiata non est (salus), non credituri præsciebantur. Yet when Augustin wrote this in the year 408, he had long since brought to a completion his doctrine of predestination; and this answer, therefore, could no longer have satisfied him: and he had already in reserve, from the standing ground of this doctrine, another answer, which he hinted at: Excepta illa altitudine sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei, ubi fortassis aliud divinum consilium longe secretius latet.

Romans. To such a mind, it would seem preferable to cut the Gordian knot, which could be resolved by no human explanation.

And so it appears, in fact, that Augustin, within the space of three or four years, had, from the point above described, changed his way of thinking on these matters; since he came to perceive that the divine and human elements did not admit of being so severed from each other; that a divine element was, in fact, contained already in faith. When, in 397, he wrote his work addressed to Simplician, bishop of Milan, in answer to various questions relating to the epistle to the Romans,* this turning point of his dogmatic bent first clearly unfolded itself to the light.† He combated in this performance the very theory which he had earlier maintained; and it is easy to perceive, in the way in which he seeks to show its untenable character, that the time had not been long since he came to this view, and was seized with the first zeal in behalf of the new light which he supposed he had found.

Here also Augustin busies himself with the explanation of those difficult passages in the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Romans;‡ but his previous mode of explanation no longer satisfied him. But whence came it, that he now explains these passages in that sense which beyond question must first offer itself when no regard is had to the connection and aim of the epistle, and made them the groundwork of his system, although at an earlier period he had explained the same passages according to the system which he supposed he had derived from the whole doctrine of scripture? Assuredly, we must look for the cause of the different impression which these passages now made on his mind, to the change in his whole mode of thinking, that grew out of his inner life. It is now clear to him, that Paul supposes neither an election of God conditioned on the foreknowledge of faith, nor an election conditioned on the foreknowledge of the works growing out of faith; for Paul, in fact, lays stress on the assertion, that God's election made a difference before the children were born,

* De diversis quæstionibus, ad Simplicianum libri duo.

† As he himself expresses it, de prædestinatione sanctorum, c. 20, in reference to the work above mentioned: *Plenius sapere cæpi in mei episcopatus exordio, quando et initium fidei donum Dei esse cognovi et asserui.*

‡ I. I. Quæst. ii

before they could believe, as well as before they could do anything.* Moreover, the desert of faith does not precede God's mercy, but it presupposes this mercy; and faith itself is one of the gifts of God's grace. Paul, in Rom. ix. 11, certainly does not set the works of man over against faith, as the ground of the calling: but he sets the calling over against works. The calling of God, therefore, is here the first cause. Faith presupposes the calling. But whence comes it, then, that the call by the preaching of the gospel and by outward circumstances, which pave the way for this, comes to some and not to others; and that the same influences from without, make a different impression on different men, nay, a different impression on the same men at different times? The almighty and all-wise God could find, in reference to the different states of men, those means of influencing them, which must make an impression on them with inward necessity, so that awakened, drawn, touched, and enlightened, they would follow, without being conscious of any resistance against the grace operating upon their will.† We must say, doubtless, man's willing is nothing without the divine mercy; but in nowise can we say, God's mercy and grace are nothing without man's willing; since God would find means of moulding every human will, in the way precisely suited to the character of each. On whomsoever he actually has mercy, whomsoever he actually chooses, him he calls in the way which is so befitting, that the subject is irresistibly drawn by him who calls, though he follows with freedom.‡ Neither is Augustin satisfied any longer to explain the hardening and the consequent rejection of one as opposed to the election of another, as a judgment specially drawn down upon the individual by his own sin; for God's almighty power, he supposes, could assuredly find the means to operate upon every degree of hardness, and the same insensibility exists everywhere alike, till God moves the heart of man by his grace.

Thus, then, Augustin comes to the result, that all men are

* Si non de operibus, quæ non erant in nondum natis, nec de fide, quia nec ipsa erat.

† Posset ita vocare, quomodo illis aptum esset, ut et moverentur et intelligerent et sequerentur.

‡ Cujus autem miseretur, sic eum vocat, quomodo scit ei congruere, ut vocantem non respuat.

found in the same state of condemnation ; the reason—not why God plunges some to destruction, which is altogether alien from God's holiness and love—but why he does not rescue some from the destruction into which all, by the guilt of the first sin, have fallen according to God's righteous judgment ; but out of his free love has mercy on others, and calls them by his grace to everlasting life—the reason of this lies in the secret and by us incomprehensible counsels of the Almighty. But to this we must ever hold fast, namely, that God's justice cannot be impeached, although the exercise and range of it may surpass the measure of our knowledge. Yet, even according to the analogy of human relations, he cannot be accused of injustice who, according to his pleasure, remits the debts of one man, while he requires payment from another.

Since, as appears from what has now been said, Augustin had completed his doctrinal system on this particular side more than ten years before the opinions of Pelagius excited any public controversy, it is clear that opposition to Pelagius could not have influenced him in forming it. With more propriety may it be said, that opposition to such doctrines as those of Augustin, or to the practical consequences which through misconstruction or abuse were derived from such doctrines, had no small share in leading Pelagius to form such a system as he did. The Pelagian tendency is to be traced, in the first place, to certain latent germs which were the undetected source of many views and opinions prevailing in the church ; and next it was called forth by the struggle to oppose various errors of practical life which had become widely spread. And then it sometimes happened that the tendency of Pelagius, and the errors to which it was opposed, proceeded from the same principle, and were but different branches springing from the same root. To explain the first of these remarks, we discern, in that tendency which separated the Christian life from its connection with the one centre which should sustain the whole of it, from the single reference to Christ as its source ; in the isolation and undue exaltation of what belongs to the human side, the over-valuation of human doing ; the separation of the moral element from its connection with the common root of all Christian life ; in the fond fancy of a perfection going beyond what the law demands, transcending ordinary Christianity ;—in a word, we discern in all that

which called forth the reaction of the Christian consciousness as it appeared in Jovinian, the incipient germs of, or point of attachment for, the Pelagian element. But history allows nothing to remain covered up and concealed. False elements, which have imperceptibly attached themselves to Christianity in its process of unfolding what it contains, must cast off their envelope, expand to the open day, and fully express themselves, that they may be overcome by the pure Christian principle. Such is the significance of the tendency of Pelagius in the course of the church development.

Pelagius was a monk of Britain.* The fact of his being trained and educated, both in that particular country and also in Monachism, had an important influence on the development of his doctrinal views. As the British church was derived originally from the Oriental, it is probable that in various ways the connection between them continued to be maintained. Pelagius was a diligent student of the Oriental church-teachers; and the form in which he found Christian anthropology exhibited in these writers, corresponded with the peculiar development of his own inner life.

Pelagius differed from Augustin, as in the whole stamp and character of his mind, so by virtue of the peculiar course of his early education and training. He did not possess, like Augustin, that mighty nature which could not otherwise attain to peace but by passing through many devious wanderings and hard conflicts. His was a feebler, more limited nature; but one, too, which could more easily develop itself in a smooth and gentle course—could more easily be controlled and conducted to its destined end. He was not possessed of the profound, speculative spirit which we find in Augustin: his predominant faculty was a sober, discreet understanding, joined with moral earnestness. In learning, he was Augustin's superior. An

* He bore the surname Pelagius Brito, to distinguish him from another individual of the same name (see Augustin, ep. 186 ad Paulinum). Moreover, the concurrent accounts of Marius Mercator, Prosper, and Orasius, mention this as his native country; and the fact that Jerome (prefat. commentar. in Jeremiam) calls him *Scotorum pultibus prægravatum* does not invalidate this testimony; for the North Britons and the Scots were not always very carefully distinguished. His name might also be a mark of his country, even though the English legend, that he bore among his own countrymen the name of *Morgan*, were without foundation.

earnest striving after moral excellence had inspired him from the first;* and his improvement had been quietly progressive. It was not from some great crisis of the inner life, not through a violent conflict, that he had attained to the faith, or to the determination of consecrating his whole life to God; but, without his being conscious of any opposition to its influences, Christianity acted as an inward principle on his moral development. He did not have to contend with a wild and fiery natural temperament, nor with desires and passions peculiarly predominant.† Nor was he thrown into any of those storms of outward life, in which he might have been called to engage in a special struggle with himself; for he led a silent life in the midst of studies and monastic asceticism. While it was the case, as we have already remarked, that among the monks belonging to a certain class of human natures, the striving after moral ideals, by which they sought to mould and fashion their inner life, excited a more profound self-contemplation, and led to a deeper self-knowledge; and while these, struck with the feeling of opposition between what they saw in their own inner life and those ideals which inspired them, sought from God manifest in Christ the removal of this opposition, and the satisfaction of their deep-felt need; others, on the contrary, by the intuition of these ideals, which seemed to them only a reflex of their own moral nature, by the successful results of their ascetic discipline, by the consciousness of a power of will to overcome the allurements of sense, were only led to feel their own moral strength, and to confide in their own moral efforts. It easily came to be the predominant thought with them, how far the man might advance towards perfection by a self-active development of the germs of goodness lying in his own moral nature, by the superior energy of the will, by self-control. It easily happened, too, that in the outward asceticism of the monastic

* Augustin, the warm but candid opponent of Pelagius, is assuredly the witness most worthy of confidence for the fact, that Pelagius, by his rigid life as a monk, had acquired universal respect. He says of him (*de peccatorum meritis et remissione*, l. III. c. 3): *Istum, sicut eum qui noverunt, loquuntur, bonum ac prædicandum virum. Ille tam egregie Christianus*—and in ep. 186 he writes concerning him: *Non solum dileximus, verum etiam diligimus eum.*

† For this description, indeed, we can cite no historical authorities, so very little is known by us respecting the life of this man; but we take the impression of him from his doctrines and writings.

life, in its efforts to subdue the sensual impulses, the true nature of inward holiness, of the disposition which has its root in love, was overlooked; that, in watching against the individual outbreaks of sin, monks neglected to pay any attention to its secret springs, and so failed in respect to the words of our Lord, Matth. xii 29. Thus they might be led to believe they had produced great outward results by human efforts, while the radical evil was as far from being cured as ever. As it regards Pelagius, it cannot be asserted, at least without qualification, that such was the effect produced on him. On the contrary, in this respect he is an example of the better moral spirit of Monachism. His letter to Demetrias,* a virgin who had been consecrated as a nun, testifies how important he felt it to be to warn men against the aberrations of the ascetic spirit, involved, though unconsciously to itself, in hypocrisy, and concealing spiritual pride under the mask of humility; to warn them against a tendency which, while it combated particular sins, thought it might indulge in others with less reserve.† He well knew how to distinguish the mock humility which covers spiritual pride, from the true humility taught by Christ. Very justly he says of his contemporaries in this regard: "Many pursue the shadow of this virtue, few its real substance;" and he then proceeds to draw a picture, taken doubtless from the life, of the mock holiness of those who assumed the outward guise of humility. "It is very easy to wear miserable clothing; to salute one's acquaintance in a lowly manner; to put on the show of humility and meekness by a drooping head and downcast eyes; to speak in a low and feeble voice, so that one's words can scarcely be heard; to sigh frequently, and with every breath call one's self a sinner and a miserable wretch;‡ and if offended but by a trifling word, suddenly to

* Written in the year 415, when he was in Palestine, and with reference to the controversies which were then going on, although they are not here expressly mentioned.

† See *e.g.* p 67, ed. Semler. Nos (proh pudor) quadam dilectione peccati, cum in quibusdam ostendimus quandam vim naturæ nostræ, in aliis omnino torpescimus. p. 69. That abstinence and jejunium were, with many, nothing else than umbracula vitiorum. On p. 74 he says respecting humility: Præcipue tamen, fictam humilitatem fugiens, illam sectare quæ vera est, quam Christus docuit humilitatem, in qua non sit superbia inclusa.

‡ Perfacile est enim, aliquam vestem habere contemptam, salutare

lift one's brow, throw back the neck, and change those submissive tones into a frantic shout.* A different sort of humility is that which Christ teaches, who exhorts us (Matth. xi. 29) to follow his example—that pattern of true humility, under which, as he tells us, no pride lies concealed.†

And now if the sense of sinfulness, which is an essential element of the Christian consciousness, frequently offered itself to him under this hypocritical form and in this lying caricature, it is easy to understand how he might be misled, by his disgust at it, to overlook the profound truth which also lay at the bottom.

But still Pelagius was not free from the errors of the monkish morality, by which the system of morals was divorced from its intimate connection with the system of faith. He was entrammelled in the notion, which was so common among the monks, being connected with their vague and obscure notions respecting the moral law, that man can advance still farther in Christian perfection than the law requires, by practising the *consilia evangelica* (so called) the *quantitative* method of estimating moral worth.‡ Neglecting to consider that the Christian principle embraces the whole alike, and leaves room for nothing else to be admitted as a determining principle, he distinguished what was commanded from what was forbidden, what was permitted from what was recommended as an object of higher perfection—which latter consisted precisely in abstaining from what was permitted, and so entitling oneself to a higher reward.§ Starting from this position, he, too, became

submissus, inclinato in terram capite oculisque dejectis, humilitatem ac mansuetudinem polliceri, lenta voce tenuique sermones infringere, suspirare crebrius, et ad omne verbum peccatorem et miserum se clamare.

* Et si vel levi sermone offensus sit, continuo attollere supercilium, levare cervicem, et delicatum illum oris sonum insano repente clamore mutare.

† Præcipue fictam humilitatem fugiens, illam sectare, quæ vera est, in qua non sit superbia inclusa.

‡ See ep. ad Demetriad. c. 9. Supra legem facere, amore perfectionis supra mandata conscendere.

§ Prohiberi quædam, præcipi quædam, concedi aliqua, nonnulla suaderi. Prohibentur mala, præcipiuntur bona, conceduntur media. perfecta suadentur. And respecting the two latter points: Duo vero reliqua, quorum unum conceditur et suadetur aliud, in nostra potestate dimissa sunt, ut aut cum minori gloria concessis utamur, aut ob majus præmium etiam ea quæ nobis permissa sunt, respuamus. Cap. 9.

a zealous opponent of Jovinian, defending against *him* the doctrine that there are different grades of merit and of Christian perfection,* on the ground of the distinction between precepts and counsels (*præcepta* and *consilia*). He controverted the position maintained by Jovinian, that there is but one way of renouncing the world, which is the common duty of all Christians—but one precept in relation to the giving up of temporal things for the sake of the kingdom of God, which, circumstances allowing, was the duty of all alike.† Ardently zealous for what he considered to be the peculiar essence of Christianity in ethics, the “precepts” and “counsels” he was led to recommend in a particular manner the study of the Bible, pointing to it as the only source from which it is possible to learn perfectly the will of God.‡ But though he examined with the strictest conscientiousness every individual passage in the New Testament relating to morals; though he recommended the exact and literal observance of all Christ’s commands, and inveighed against the allegorizing shifts by which it was attempted to bring the words of Christ into a forced accommodation with the ruling manners of the world;§ yet he could not penetrate below the surface into the more profound depths of the Christian system of ethics, into its peculiar essence, its internal connection and unity; because he seized the parts in too insulated a manner, without grasping the whole new principle for shaping the world and human life, which lies in Christianity. He failed of seeing the connection between faith and life as it is presented in the New Testament. Hence,

* On 2 Corinth. xi. 6. *Contra Jovinianum etiam hic locus facit, ubi meritorum gradus esse monstrantur*; and on Philipp. iii. 18, 19. *Potest et de Joviniani studiis accipi, qui jejuniorum afflictiones et omnem corporis cruciatum in luxuriam et epulas converterit.*

† On 1 Corinth. xiii. 3. *Quod illorum sententiam destruit, qui renuntiandum rebus seculi certo tempore, persecutione cogente, volunt esse præceptum, ut et apostolis gloriam tollant, quod non voluntarie fecerint, sed inviti, et nostri ævi perfectos vanos constituent, qui rem alterius temporis frustra nunc voluerunt exercere. Item aliter: Notandum quod contemptus mundi martyrio comparetur, contra eos, qui illud de evangelio variis argumentis nituntur exsolvere, ubi dicitur ad divitem: Vade, vende omnia quæ habes, et da pauperibus.*

‡ Thus he writes to Demetrias: *In scripturis divinis, per quas solas potes plenam Dei intelligere voluntatem.* Cap. 9.

§ On 2 Corinth. iii. 6. *Si præcepta velis allegorice intelligere, omnem virtutem eorum evacuas, omnibus aperuisti viam delinquendi.*

there was this difference betwixt Augustin and Pelagius, that while the one could rightly understand, in the sermon on the mount, every single precept in its unity with the whole, according to the spirit of it, and found therein no separate, positive commands; Pelagius, on the other hand, everywhere held fast to the letter of the individual precepts, and so took in its literal sense the prohibition of the oath.*

In order to explain the peculiar doctrinal tendency of Pelagius, we must take particular notice also of the opposite tendencies against which he contended. This is the more necessary in his case, inasmuch as he was not led by any creative, speculative, or dogmatizing spirit of his own to form a new system; but his efforts were determined and shaped by a present, practical interest, to guard against certain errors which seemed to him injurious to morality. Thus he was led to elaborate his peculiar scheme of doctrine. He contended against the doctrinal tendencies of his time, only so far as certain practical consequences of a hurtful kind seemed to him necessarily to flow from them: by this he was induced to enter upon his doctrinal investigations and distinctions; and, in mainly following this practical interest, he did not even go so far as to unfold in their whole extent, and to trace to their ultimate grounds, the principles lying at the root of his doctrinal tenets. Next, by virtue of his truly earnest moral zeal, he was led to regard it as specially incumbent on him to combat the worldly Christianity of his times. We everywhere see in him a man filled with pain and indignation at the moral depravation of the great masses of nominal Christians in his day. Thus, in his remarks on 2 Corinth. xii. 20, he exclaims: "What would the apostle do, if he happened on our times, when, in comparison with other vices, such things are not considered to be sins at all?"† He sought to remove the grounds of excuse which served as props of their immorality to those who called themselves Christians, without considering themselves bound to pursue a Christian course of conduct. Among these belonged that distinction of spiritual and secular, respecting the injurious influence of which we have already spoken;

* *Christus jussit non jurare. Ep. ad Demetriad. c. 19; Hilar. ad Augustin. ep. 156.*

† *Quid faceret, si nostris temporibus adveniret, quibus ad comparisonem aliorum criminum ista ne putantur quidem esse peccata!*

though in one sense Pelagius himself supported it by his doctrine of a perfection transcending ordinary Christianity. In combating this distinction, when employed as an excuse for immorality by those who were engaged in the business of the world, he says, in expounding Ephesians iv. 4, 5, "It would be well for those persons to study what is here said, who, tied to the business of the world, suppose they may be allowed to sin, though others may not; when the truth is, all are baptized into the same body, have received the same spirit, and are called to the same hope."* He felt constrained to dissent from such as seemed to imagine that by a mere outward participation in the sacraments they were already sure of salvation, as well as from those who reposed on the *opus operatum* of faith, that outward and superficial notion of faith, which, as we have seen, was already so widely spread in the church. So, in remarking on 1 Cor. x. 1, he says, that no one might so rely on the fact of his having been baptized, or having partaken of the Holy Supper, as to imagine that God would indulge him in committing sin, the apostle brings forward this example from the fathers, to show by it that these rites will indeed then be truly profitable, when the commandments are obeyed.† And the words in Ephes. v. 5, 6, he applies to those who imagined faith alone to be sufficient; that he who possessed faith and had been baptized could not perish however he might sin.‡ Next, as there were those who comforted themselves in their vicious life with the doctrine of a purgatory, flattering themselves that, in virtue of their orthodox creed, they would finally, at least, be saved, after having passed through that painful process of purification after death, Pelagius in explaining 1 Corinth. iii. 13, a passage often referred to in proof of this

* Unde diligentius legere debent hunc locum hi qui, in seculi occupationibus ligati, putant sibi licere peccare et aliis non licere, cum omnes in unum corpus baptizati, eundem spiritum acceperint, et in una spe vocati sunt Dei.

† Ne quis confidens in eo solum, quod baptizatus est, aut in esca spirituali vel potu, putet sibi Deum parcere si peccaverit, tale patrum proponit exemplum, quo ostendat, tunc ista merito profutura, si præcepta serventur.

‡ Contra illos agit, qui solam fidem dicunt sufficere. "Nemo vos seducat" dicendo; hoc solummodo opus est, ut fides sit et homo Christi baptismum consequatur, quamvis peccet, perire non potest. Comp. what he says on 1 Corinth. vi. 9.

doctrine, sought to deprive them of this support, by demonstrating the groundlessness of that exposition, and proving that, even in this passage, the fire of hell is meant, which the vicious should not escape.* And hence he deemed it so important to maintain the eternity of punishments, in opposition to those who explained all such declarations of scripture as being nothing more than intimidating threats against sin.† Furthermore, as these persons excused themselves by pleading the corruption and weakness of human nature, and affirmed that living up to the divine commands was something too difficult for feeble man, Pelagius, to deprive them of these supports of moral indolence, endeavoured to show that they unjustly loaded human nature with charges which fell back on the Creator himself, instead of laying the fault, as they should do, on their own will. The divine commands, he maintained, the commands of Christ, certainly required an exact fulfilment, as in fact they were, in spite of their contrary assertions, taught by the example of those who *had* fulfilled them, while still they partook of the same human nature with themselves.‡

By these oppositions and these practical interests, then, the tendency of Pelagius, in respect to the doctrine of man's nature and the character and work of Christ, was modified and determined. Hence he was of the opinion that in all moral exhortations the great point to be aimed at was, to make men clearly see that they were in want of none of the faculties necessary for fulfilling the divine commands; to bring them to a conscious sense of the power bestowed on them by the Creator for accomplishing all good ends, and he says that he

* Non hic, ut quidam putant, in igne flammæ assura sunt opera, sed homines, qui ita operati sunt ut mereantur incendio deputari. Si autem opera, id est, crimina, punieatur, salvo eo qui perpetraverat, non erit ei damnum, sed lucrum.

† On 2 Corinth. xi. 3. Jam nunc serpens similiter quosdam seducit, gehennam propter solum terrorem asserentes nominari, quam aut penitus non esse aut æternam non esse affirmant, contra auctoritatem omnium scripturarum.

‡ In the letter to Demetrias: Dicimus: durum est, arduum est, non possumus, homines sumus, fragili carne circumdati—c. 3: Improbissimi hominum dum dissimulant, id ipsum bene administrare, quod facti sunt, aliter se factos fuisse malunt, ut qui vitam suam emendare nolunt, videantur emendare velle naturam. And on Coloss. i. 22: Vide si sciebat, se impossibilia præcepisse.

himself was accustomed to pursue this method in his exhortatory writings.* Hence he appealed to the examples of virtue exhibited among the pagans, in proof of how much nature, left to itself, could effect even among the heathen; and argued that with the new aids and advantages possessed by Christians, the same nature would be able to do still more. On this principle, and from this point of view, he denied that there was any such thing as a corruption of human nature, which had grown out of the fall. Such a doctrine appeared to him but a means of encouraging moral indolence—a means of excuse supplied to the hands of vicious men. The question which from the first had so occupied the profound mind of Augustin—the question concerning the origin of sin in man—could not be attended with so much difficulty to the more superficial mind of Pelagius. This was no enigma for him; it seemed to him a thing perfectly natural that there should be moral evil. The necessary condition to the existence of moral good is the possibility of evil. Evil and good are to be derived alike from the free-will, which either yields to the seductions of sense, or overcomes them.

With these views of man's nature, Pelagius unquestionably still held fast to all the tenets taught in the Western church respecting the character and work of Christ; but although this was by no means a mere hypocritical accommodation—though he was not conscious in this case of any self-contradiction, yet everything must necessarily have been so modified as to tally with his peculiar views of human nature. Augustin, as well as Pelagius, contended against those who represented a mere outward faith to be all that was necessary to secure salvation; but Augustin and Pelagius differed from each other in their mode of attacking this error. Augustin opposed to this notion of faith another and different one: Pelagius sought to show that there must be, in addition to faith, the fulfilment of the divine commands; Augustin described an active life of good works, as something which flowed of itself from the

* Thus in his letter to Demetrias, c. 2, he says: *Quem ego exhortationis ordinem, cum in aliis quoque opusculis tenuerim, tunc hic maxime observandum puto. ubi eo plenius naturæ bonum declarari debet, quo instituenda est vita perfectior, ne tanto remissior sit ad virtutem animus ac tardior, quanto minus se posse credat, et dum quod inesse sibi ignorat, id se existimat non habere.*

essence of genuine faith :* Pelagius required it as something which must be added to faith, by employing those moral faculties which had been bestowed on human nature, and which was still further strengthened and enlarged by Christianity. And, in addition to this, Pelagius, who regarded it as a thing of the utmost importance to point men to the free-will by which they were able to do all things, was the more provoked to opposition, by the form under which the unfolded doctrine of Augustin concerning grace and predetermination, which was really revolting to the free will, presented itself to his notice. But with the dogmatic prejudices and partial interest in behalf of the doctrine of free-will which he possessed, any form wherein the Christian consciousness expressed itself, with sincerity and fulness, as indebted for all things to the divine grace, would easily appear offensive, as detracting from the freedom of the will. Hence the great offence he took when he heard a bishop utter, as expressing his own feelings, the words of the prayer in Augustin's confessions :† “ My God, bestow on me what thou commandest, and command what thou wilt.” ‡

At Rome, Pelagius composed his commentaries on the epistles of Paul, in which he clearly manifests his peculiar doctrinal tendency ; and among these, his commentary on the epistle to the Romans especially, although Cassiodorus sought to expurgate it, still betrays the Pelagian doctrine concerning man, which continually gleams through the surface. At that time, however, the matter made no farther stir. The public outbreak of the controversy proceeded from another defender of the same doctrine.

This was Cœlestius, with whom Pelagius first became acquainted while the former was an advocate at Rome. Through the influence, probably, of Pelagius, this person became zealously resolved to live a more earnest and devoted Christian life in a strict observance of all the precepts and counsels of Christ. He exchanged his profession as an advocate for the monastic life, and composed an exhortatory Christian treatise, in the form of three letters addressed to his parents, in which he probably explained the reasons which

* As, for example, in his work *de fide et operibus*, which is aimed against the above-mentioned error. See vol. III. p. 142.

† Confess. l. X. c. 29.

‡ *Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis.*

had induced him to change his plans of life. It would appear, then, that he followed the whole peculiar pratico-dogmatical tendency of the individual who had been the means of awakening him to a more serious Christian life; and he sought to turn the skill in dialectics, which he had acquired as an advocate, to the purpose of defending his scheme of doctrine.* Pelagius, owing to his peculiar temperament and advanced age, was little inclined to controversy, where he was not drawn into it by the interest he felt in behalf of his practical principles. He willingly made concessions, even against his own convictions, where those principles which alone seemed important to him seemed not to be endangered. But Cœlestius, who was in the full vigour of manhood, and formed as an advocate for polemical controversy, stood forth more openly and recklessly in defence of the doctrinal principles connected with that practical system.†

* Respecting the native country of this individual, nothing certain can be said. That he was a native of Ireland or Scotland has been inferred, on no very safe grounds, from an enigmatical passage of Jerome, in the preface to the III. book of his commentary on Jeremiah. Marius Mercator says of him, in his *commonitorium adversus hæresin Pelagii et Cœlestii*: *Pelagio adhæsit Cœlestius, nobilis natu quidem, et illius temporis auditorialis scholasticus*. Augustin says, *de gestis Pelagii*, s. 61, that these erroneous doctrines had not originated with the clergy, but with *quibusdam veluti monachis*. He meant here, probably, Cœlestius along with Pelagius. He styled them not regular monks, doubtless because they lived rather after the older and freer manner of the ascetics than according to the more recent order of the Cœnobites. With all this is to be compared what Gennadius says, in his work *de viris illustribus*, c. 44, that Cœlestius, when a young man, before he fell into the Pelagian doctrines, wrote those three letters mentioned in the text, which Gennadius highly applauds, making the remark, important for us: *Moralis siquidem in eis dictio nil vitii postmodum proditi; sed totum ad virtutis incitamentum tenuit*. The tendency of which he speaks in this last clause, might very well be also a Pelagian one; but Gennadius, himself a semi-Pelagian, had not the sagacity to discern this Pelagian element lying at the root of the practical tendency, but not so clearly expressed. Hence he supposed Cœlestius must have composed this treatise when a young man, and before he went over to Pelagianism. Whether the statement, that he wrote these letters from a cloister, is correct, may also remain a question.

† Augustinus, *de peccato originali*, s. 13, calls Cœlestius *apertior, Pelagius occultior*. Whether the account given by Prædestinatus is correct (p. 88), that Cœlestius had also written a work against the doctrine of the traduction of souls, before Pelagius appeared openly as a polemic, is questionable.

In the year 411, Pelagius and Cœlestius went in company to Carthage, where the former, indeed, made but a short stay; but Cœlestius tarried longer. His ascetic zeal and his gifts procured for him friends, and he was encouraged to propose himself as a candidate for the office of presbyter in this church; but meanwhile various reports had followed him concerning his Pelagian errors, which here, where the opposite tendency of the dogmatic spirit chiefly prevailed, and where the mind of Augustin had the most decided influence, could not do otherwise than injure him.* The deacon Paulinus, of Milan, stood forth as his accuser, before a synod assembled at Carthage, A.D. 412. Six heretical propositions were asserted to be held by Cœlestius, which collectively were derived from the following: That the sin of Adam had injured only himself, not the whole human family; whence was drawn the conclusion that children still came into the world in the same state in which Adam found himself before the fall. From these two propositions others were deduced, none of which probably had ever been asserted by Cœlestius in the form alleged, while several of them were ascribed to him only by inference. He sought to turn off the whole matter by maintaining that the dispute related to a merely speculative question, and had nothing to do with the essential doctrines of faith. He said the only point in dispute here related, in fact, to the question concerning the propagation of a sinful nature;† which question, however, was closely connected with the more general one concerning the way in which souls are propagated. As on the last of these questions, so also on the first, various opinions had been held in the church. On these

* Pelagius, who did not find Augustin at home at Hippo, had written him a very respectful letter. Augustin answered him in a few friendly lines, which at bottom, however, might already intimate some suspicion about the doctrine of Pelagius concerning grace, as Augustin afterwards (*de gestis Pelagii*, c. 26) actually explained the words, but putting into them more, perhaps, than they really meant. At all events, there was a very delicate allusion to the importance of the right doctrine concerning grace. He wrote to him, for example: *Retribuat tibi Dominus bona, quibus semper sis bonus—ores pro me, quo talis a Domino fiam, qualem me jam esse arbitraris*. Ep. 146. But without doubt, Augustin, who, on account of the peculiar tone of his mind, was habituated to such forms of expression, might thus express himself, without having in his mind any particular allusion to the views of Pelagius.

† *De traduce peccati.*

points nothing had been decided by the church system of doctrine. On account of his own particular views, then, on such a disputed matter, no one could be regarded as a teacher of false doctrine.* Had he denied the necessity of infant baptism (now universally acknowledged to be an apostolical tradition), that charge might seriously affect him; but, in truth, he also affirmed the necessity of this rite, although he entered into no farther explanation of the grounds of its necessity. With these evasive answers, however, men were in nowise satisfied; and as he could not be induced to condemn the opinions which he was accused of maintaining, he was excluded from the fellowship of the church.†

But more favourable for the cause of Pelagius were the circumstances under which the controversy was renewed in another country. Pelagius, in the year 415, made a journey to Palestine, and in this way the controversy was spread to that part of the world; for Jerome was then living at Bethlehem, and he maintained a close correspondence with the Western church, and was moreover a man whose interest in theological polemics could easily be set in movement. He agreed with Augustin in opposing the Pelagian doctrine concerning the free-will, and concerning the freedom from corruption of human nature; and, owing to the connection in which this controversy seemed to him to stand with another, which at an earlier period had passionately interested him, he was led to attach to it much the greater weight. We refer to its connection with the Origenistic disputes. Jerome was inclined to trace the Pelagian doctrine concerning free-will and the moral powers of man's nature to the influence of Origen and of Rufinus, whom he now so thoroughly hated, and to look upon Pelagius as a disciple of Rufinus. In addition to this, it happened that Jerome, who was so sensitive to all personal attacks, and so slow to forget them, was told that Pelagius had, on various points, attacked his commentary on the epistle to the Ephesians and his letter against Jovinian;‡ and for these reasons he was already much excited against him.§ A young Spanish eccle-

* *Quæstionis res ista, non hæresis.*

† See Marius Mercator, *commonitorium super nomine Cælestii*. Augustin. *de peccato originis*, c. ii.

‡ See vol. III p. 285.

§ See his bitter taunts against Pelagius, whose person he describes, without naming him, in the preface to his commentary on Jeremiah.

siastic, Paulus Orosius, was then on a visit to Jerome at Bethlehem. This person was a disciple, and an enthusiastic and servile follower of Augustin. His professed object was to prosecute his studies under the direction of Jerome; and he gave the latter a more distinct account of this recent controversy, and proposed to him many questions relative to the whole matter in dispute. Jerome came out as a writer against Pelagius, in the first place without mentioning his name;* but Pelagius without difficulty found many friends in the Oriental church, to which he stood in a very different relation, as it concerned his system of faith, from that which he held to the church of the West.† To such nice distinctions on the relation of free-will to grace, the members of the Oriental church were, in fact, as a general thing, not accustomed. Moreover, it had in nowise occurred to any one there to give such prominence to the antithesis between grace and free-will, as has been done in the Western church. Many of the assertions of Augustin would in this church have given great offence. The less men were acquainted here with the disputed questions of the Western church, and the less interest they felt in them, the more easily could they be made easy by the general declarations of Pelagius; and the latter was, besides, much more at home in the Oriental system of doctrine than were his opponents.

When, in the year 415, Paul Orosius appeared before a synod assembled under the presidency of the bishop John (who had long been suspected by the friends of Jerome), and composed of presbyters connected with his church, he supposed he should easily be able to supplant the monk and layman, by means of the authority of the great bishop whose mind ruled the North African church.‡ But the worthy bishop John, of Jerusalem, who had already distinguished himself by many conflicts with blind zealots, was not disposed to lend his hand to any such measures of oppression. When it was objected to Pelagius that he taught doctrines controverted by Augustin,

* In his letter to Ctesiphon, and in his dialogues.

† This Jerome himself intimates, in his letter to Ctesiphon, where he speaks of the question brought into discussion by Pelagius: *Quæ ante literas tuas plerosque in Oriente decepit, ut per simulatam humilitatem superbiam discerent.*

‡ Although we become acquainted with these proceedings only through the passionate report of Orosius himself, yet the latter is so confused as to testify against himself.

the former, who would do homage to no human authority, replied, as he might safely do in the Oriental church, where Augustin's name hardly stood at this time in so high authority as in the church of the West—"And what matter is it to me what Augustin says?"* This remark was sufficient to stir up the indignation of Augustin's enthusiastic friends. They exclaimed that he who ventured to calumniate the bishop to whom the whole North African church owed its restoration,† deserved to be excluded not only from that assembly, but from the fellowship of the whole church. But, without paying any attention to this outcry, the bishop John rather took the part of the man who was to be put down by dogmatic assertions. Dispensing with all hierarchical prejudices, he allowed him, though but a monk and layman, to take his seat among the presbyters; a proceeding for which he is highly censured by Orosius, who complains that he should permit a person accused of manifest heresy—though to be sure that person had never as yet been heard before any ecclesiastical body—to sit among Catholics; a layman to sit among presbyters.‡ The bishop John said he would now like to be Augustin, that he might pardon Pelagius in Augustin's name.

Pelagius was accused of maintaining that man is without sin, and can easily obey the divine commands if he pleases. As the bishop John, like the Orientals generally, had no very strict or profound conception of what constitutes the fulfilment of the law, he believed examples could be found in the sacred scriptures of a perfect fulfilment of the law.§ All that appeared to him as false was the assertion that it was possible for any man to accomplish this without the divine assistance. But when Pelagius acknowledged the divine assistance to be necessary here, the bishop was perfectly satisfied. It

* *Et quis est mihi Augustinus?* Perhaps, however, Pelagius may not have originally expressed the answer in precisely the form in which the hostile and embittered Orosius here repeats it.

† Doubtless referring to his efforts in healing the schism of the Donatists.

‡ The words of Orosius are: *Videlicet laicum in concessu presbyterorum, reum hæreseos manifestæ in medio Catholicorum, sedere præcepit.*

§ He appealed to what had been said of Zechariah and of Elizabeth, Luke i.; to God's command given to Abraham that he should walk before him and be perfect: which pre-supposed the possibility of the thing required.

was quite foreign from him to propose to the former such questions as would have been proposed to him in the Western church, with a view to draw from him an explanation of what he understood by the divine assistance. He was satisfied with the explanation expressed in those general terms; and any one who, after this, was still bent on detecting heresy in the doctrine of Pelagius, seemed to him to detract himself from the power of divine grace. Finally, the accusers of Pelagius repeatedly affirmed that both the parties belonged to the Latin church; and hence the question was one which only in the Latin church could be rightly understood. The bishop John conceded this, and agreed that the subject should be referred to the Roman bishop Innocent, and meanwhile both parties should cease all further attacks on each other.

This attack on Pelagius having issued in a manner so little favourable to their views, the hostile party, consisting for the most part of ecclesiastics from the West, who probably held their consultations at Bethlehem,* determined to renew the assault before another bishop, and a still more numerous assembly. In the same year the two deposed Western bishops, Heros of Arles, and Lazarus of Aix (Aquæ), appeared as the accusers of Pelagius, before a synod assembled at Diospolis in Palestine, under the presidency of Eulogius, bishop of Cæsarea. The propositions laid to his charge on this occasion were partly statements in which, as they expressed it, the heretical element could not be easily detected, and on which, by means of super-added explanations, Pelagius might easily come to an understanding with his judges.† The members of this council were

* A significant hint on this point is contained in a letter of Pelagius to a presbyter who was his friend, written after the conclusion of the second council, and giving an account of the decision of this assembly: *Quæ sententia omnem in malum conspirantem societatem ab invicem separavit. Augustin. de gestis Pelagii. s. 54.* And, in fact, Heros and Lazarus did actually return to the West. He might, then, have had good grounds for considering all these undertakings as the concerted plan of a party, which had associated for the purpose of bringing about his condemnation in the Oriental church. Yet if the whole thing had in this case been previously concocted, the points of complaint would, in all probability, not have been so unskilfully arranged.

† Thus it was objected to him that he had asserted: "*In die judicii iniquis et peccatoribus non esse parcendum: sed æternis eos ignibus esse exurendos.*" It is most probable—which is also confirmed by Augustin's remark on this passage in his book *de gestis Pelagii*—that Pelagius had

also disposed to ask no further questions, provided only that grace and free-will were both equally maintained ; and accordingly Pelagius found it not difficult to satisfy his judges. He was charged with holding the doctrine, "that man, if he pleases, can be perfectly free from sin ; that there was such a thing as perfect purity from sin among mankind." This he explained by saying that he who is converted from sin may live without sin by his own efforts and God's grace ; but that he is not, for this reason, placed also beyond the reach of all temptations. Understood with these limitations, the synod were likewise all of the same opinion. It was now required of him that he should pronounce sentence of condemnation against all who taught the contrary. He consented ; yet on the singular condition that he might condemn them as fools, not as heretics.* Furthermore, some of the propositions which had

combated those who held out the promise of final salvation to a dead church faith, not connected with a change of heart, but subsisting along with a vicious life, at least after suffering disciplinary punishment in the ignis purgatorius. His sincere zeal for morality may perhaps have moved him to deny altogether the doctrine of such an ignis purgatorius. When this proposition was brought before him, he appealed in defence of his assertion to the word of Christ himself, Matth. xxv. 46 ; and whoever believed otherwise, he added, was an Origenist. With this the synod was satisfied ; for the Origenistic doctrine concerning the ἀποκατάστασις had always had, though not all, yet the majority of the most influential voices in the church against it. But had Pelagius unfolded his views more fully, and also represented the doctrine of that purgatorial fire as an Origenistic heresy, the members of the council would perhaps not have been so easily satisfied. Another assertion was : Quoniam plus facimus quam in lege et evangelio jussum est, in conformity with the doctrine of the consilia evangelica, which was so intimately connected with the monastic system of morals, and in which Pelagius might certainly find some support for his system. Pelagius cites, in defence of this proposition, the remark of Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 25, in recommendation, as it was generally supposed, of celibacy. Furthermore, the proposition : "The kingdom of heaven is promised even in the Old Testament." In this proposition, the sense corresponding to the orthodox faith admits, of course, of being more easily found than the heretical. The heretical sense, it may be conjectured, lay in the assertion, that men could obtain salvation by observance of the law ; that there was a justitia legis. See below.

* Anathematizo tanquam stultos, non tanquam hæreticos. It is evident that the synod here proceeded in a very superficial way, with little regard for rigid and precise dogmatic notions. It is not clear, indeed, what it was that Pelagius really condemned. If he meant to condemn those who taught that there were sinless men, the purport of his declara-

come from Cœlestius were read to him ; but for these he maintained that he was not to be held accountable, since they were none of his. He was even ready to condemn them, although it would seem as if he could not do it without also condemning many of his own doctrines. But perhaps the matter was made easy to him by hastily reading over the propositions, and forbearing to enter into any minute inquiries.* As the result of the whole business Pelagius was recognized as a member of the Catholic church. From the relation of Pelagius to the Oriental church, we may infer that he found many friends there, especially among the monks ; and this passionate class of men may have resorted to many measures in support of the party of Pelagius, of which the latter himself wholly disapproved. Moreover, Jerome, by his passionate and overbearing temper,† by his reproachful abuse of the bishops of this country, may have rendered himself hateful to many, who now sought to take their revenge on him. But whatever the truth may be with regard to those violent proceedings said to have taken place in the cloisters at Bethlehem after the triumph obtained by Pelagius at the council of Diospolis, yet certainly the accounts of them, all of which may in the end be traced to the testimony of Jerome, which deserves but little confidence in

tion may have been, that the question did not relate to doctrine, but to a fact. A false doctrine—he must have meant, in this case, to say—could only arise when it was asserted that such persons had so lived *without* grace. Otherwise to affirm, as a matter of fact this which was contrary to experience, ought not to be called false doctrine, but foolishness ; but if we suppose this, Pelagius could not be exonerated from the charge of surrendering his own convictions, or of contradicting himself. Or perhaps he meant to condemn those who taught that men could lead sinless lives without the help of divine grace. But when we consider what a broad conception Pelagius connected with the term grace, it may easily be explained that he meant to say : Those who declared grace could be dispensed with in order to a sinless life, deserved to be styled fools and madmen for teaching a doctrine so perfectly absurd.

* It is very possible that, as Augustin remarks (*de gestis Pelagii*, s. 57), in a brief transcript of those proceedings, he may, not without good reasons, have left out the express condemnation of those propositions of Cœlestius.

† Palladius, who to be sure belonged to a party hostilely disposed to Jerome, represents another as saying of him (*hist. lausiaca*, c. 78.): Τοσαύτην ἔσχεν βασκανίαν, ὥς ὑπὸ ταυτῆς καλύπτεσθαι τῶν λόγων τὴν ἀρετὴν χάριν δὲ τούτου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐ μὴ ἅγιος ἀνὴρ εἰς τοὺς τόπους οἰκήσει, ἀλλὰ φθάσει αὐτοῦ ὁ φθόνος καὶ μέχρι τοῦ ἰδιοῦ ἀδιελφού.

matters so nearly concerning himself and his personal enemies,* are not sufficiently distinct and well authenticated to enable us correctly to judge to what extent Jerome was to blame in this affair, and whether any party of Pelagius had a hand in it, and, if so, what they did. One thing we may confidently assert, that it was quite foreign to the disposition of the latter to intermeddle with such business. Had it been possible really to bring any such accusation against him, his enemies assuredly would not have long delayed to produce the more definite testimony which the Roman bishop Innocent demanded.

The verdicts of these two councils were now made the most of by the party of Pelagius, to justify their own orthodoxy. Their opponents, it is true, did not allow themselves to falter at these decisions; yet they took different measures according to their different turns of mind. The violent Jerome did not hesitate to fix a suspicion of Pelagian heresy on the synod itself.† Augustin, on the other hand, endeavoured to show, in his work *De gestis Pelagii*, that the synod had only suffered itself to be deceived by the ambiguous explanations of Pelagius, but that, by the anathemas which it prescribed to him, it had in reality condemned his peculiar doctrines. Here, we must admit, he went on the erroneous supposition, that as Christian truth is but one, and the doctrine of the church but one, therefore the doctrine of grace held by this synod must have been the same with that of the whole Oriental church.

As a counterpoise to the authority of these Oriental church assemblies, it was sought, moreover, to gain the acquiescence of the Roman bishop Innocent. Three letters were therefore addressed to him from the North-African church, in the year 416; one from a synod held at Carthage; the second, from one held at Mileve in Numidia; the third, from five North-African bishops, of whom Augustin was one. In these letters they accused Pelagius and Cœlestius of maintaining free-will in a way that excluded grace, and of denying grace in the peculiar Christian sense, since they did not place it in an inward actuation and communication of the divine Spirit; but only understood thereby, either the gifts and powers bestowed on man by creation, or the outward revelation by the law, or

* See the conclusion in Augustin's book *de gestis Pelagii*, and three letters of the Roman bishop Innocent.

† He styles it (ep. 81) *synodus miserabilis*.

the forgiveness of sin. They were also accused of denying the necessity of baptism in order to the salvation of infants. At the same time these bishops sent him a book of Pelagius, in which they had marked several passages, which he was requested to notice.

In the meantime, Pelagius and Coelestius also sought to justify themselves before the Roman bishop. Pelagius wrote him a letter, in which he defended himself against both the charges: namely, that he asserted a free-will standing in no need of grace,* and that he denied the necessity of baptism in order to the salvation of infants.† With this letter he sent a confession of faith, in which he fully unfolded his orthodoxy on those points which had no connection with this controversy. On the matters in dispute, he declared himself with less distinctness, and also indulged himself a good deal in special pleading, for the purpose of setting the doctrine of his opponents in an unfavourable light; attacking, though without naming him, Jerome in particular, who, indeed, by his exaggerations in controversy, and his arguments, which were often spun out and lost in mere play and sophistry, exposed many a weak point to his adversaries.‡ Pelagius, on this

* *Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus, nos indigere Dei semper auxilio.*

† Respecting his doctrine concerning the baptism of infants see below. The fragments of this letter may be found in Augustin. *de gratia Christi*, c. 30, 32, et 33, and *de peccato originali*, c. 17 et 21.

‡ Pelagius says, accordingly, he abhorred the blasphemies of those who taught that God had commanded men to do impossibilities, and that God's commands could not be fulfilled by individuals, but only by all, collectively and in common. This remark is aimed against the doctrine held alike by Augustin and Jerome, that human nature, in its present state, is not able to fulfil the divine law—especially in the form in which it had been expressed by Jerome, when he said, that as at present everything good among men was in some respect or other defective or partial, so they mutually supplied each other's deficiencies by means of the predominant virtues in individuals. See Hieronym. l. I. adv. Pelag. f. 496-97, T. IV. ed. Martianay. Again, Pelagius said, we condemn those who affirm that the Son of God was necessitated to utter what was false by the power of the flesh; and that, on account of his assumption of human nature, he could not do all which he willed. In one respect, so far as it regards the last proposition, this charge was unjust. Jerome, for instance, had asserted—citing as his authority the passages in Matth. xxvi. 39; John v. 30—that Jesus, in speaking as a man, had not made himself independent of God, nor ascribed to himself any self-sufficiency grounded in human nature; while, on the contrary, the Pelagians would

occasion also, asserted a free-will constantly standing in need of the divine assistance; and he charged his opponents with maintaining partly the Manichean doctrine, that certain men (those who do not participate of grace) cannot avoid sin, partly the Jovinian, that certain men (the predestinate) are by nature incapable of sin. He himself taught, on the contrary, that man is always capable both of sinning and of not sinning.

The Roman bishop, Innocent, received those letters from the North-African church before the letter and confession of faith sent by Pelagius could reach him. Innocent, as may be gathered from his letters, was, on the doctrine concerning the relation of nature to grace, a decided opponent of the Pelagian system: it would seem, also, that he penetrated more deeply than others into the original grounds of this whole matter of dispute.* Still, it cannot be inferred, however, from any declarations of his, that he entirely agreed in his system with Augustin. On the contrary, an intimation is given, that, inasmuch as he held the communications of divine grace to be dependent on the worth of individuals, he accordingly differed from Augustin in an important point.† Yet, at all events, the heretical matter in the Pelagian doctrines first attracted his notice; and of any difference between his own views and those of the North

fain claim for themselves an independence and self-sufficiency, which Christ himself had never thought of asserting. But the objection was just with reference to the first of those propositions; for, citing the passage in John vii. 10, which Porphyry had seized upon as a ground for accusing Christ of fickleness of purpose, he said in justification of Christ: *Omnia scandala ad carnem esse referenda*, which were either, like many of the sayings of Jerome, sounding words without any reasonable meaning, or must have been intended to mean that the weakness of the sensuous nature even in Christ rendered it necessary to deviate from the strict law of veracity. L. c. f. 519, 20, 21.

* He perceived (see below) that this dispute was connected with a different way of regarding the relation of God's providence to creation, s. 3. *Epistola ad Concil. Carthag. Ergo eris tibi in providendo præstantior, quam potest in eo esse, qui te ut esses effecit? Et cui putas debere quod vivis, quomodo non putas illi debere quod quotidianam ejus consequendo gratiam taliter vivis?*

† Innocent. ep. ad Concil. Carthag. s. 7. Of the Pelagians: *Quis tantus illorum pectora error obcæcat, ut si ipsi nullam Dei gratiam sentiunt, quia nec digni sunt nec merentur.* To be sure, Augustin would have no difficulty in explaining this according to his own sense, by simply supposing the *dignitas* and the *mereri* to be qualities depending on the communication of grace.

Africans, he may, perhaps, not have been conscious. Moreover, the North-African church had already conciliated his favourable regard by appealing to his decision on such a matter of dispute. After having bestowed praise, then, on the North-African bishops, because, as in duty bound, they had betaken themselves to the church of Peter, to which all the great concerns of entire Christendom should be ultimately referred, he assured them of his full acquiescence in their condemnation of the Pelagian doctrines.

But soon after, in the year 416, Innocent died; and his successor Zosimus had already been invested with the episcopal dignity, when the letter of Pelagius arrived at Rome. Zosimus, in all probability, had not the same doctrinal system as his predecessor. Perhaps, as his name might indicate, he was of Oriental descent; and his dogmatic tendency on the controverted points may have been akin to that of the East; all which seems, in fact, to be shown in his first letter on this subject to the North-African church. Hence his sentence would turn out to be a very different one from the former. Neither were there wanting in Rome individuals who were friendly to the Pelagian doctrines, and who contributed to dispose his mind to look upon them with favour. While Innocent was living, such individuals would, of course, keep their opinions to themselves.* At present, they could more openly avow themselves.

Under these more favourable circumstances, Cœlestius himself appeared in Rome. He handed over to the Roman bishop a confession of faith, which was well suited doubtless to make a favourable impression on one who was not aware of the more profound connection and coherence of individual doctrines with the whole system of Christian faith, and hence was in no condition to form a correct judgment concerning the importance of the controverted points. He, too, first unfolded at large the pure doctrines on matters which had no connection whatever with the dispute, and then, as before, sought to reduce the disputed matters to mere questions of speculative controversy, such as related to the propagation of sin, which was connected with the question concerning the origin of souls. "If some questions have been started which do not concern the faith, and respecting which multitudes have differed, it

* *Innocentii epistola ad quinque episcopos*, s. 2.

had never entered his thoughts to establish anything, as the founder of a new doctrine; but he would very cheerfully allow himself to be corrected, where he had erred as a man, by the judgment of the Roman bishop."* At the same time, he maintained anew, that the acknowledgment of the necessity of infant baptism, which by the rule of the universal church must be imparted for the forgiveness of sin, was altogether independent of those questions, because our Lord had resolved that the kingdom of heaven may be bestowed only on the baptized; and because the powers of nature did not suffice for this, it must be imparted by grace. But, by so doing, he meant in no wise to approve the doctrine of a natural propagation of sin; for sin, as it consisted in a determination of the will, could not be derived from nature.† The point of view in which Cœlestius placed this matter certainly appeared very clear in the outset to Zosimus; for it seemed sufficient to him that free-will and grace should be equally maintained, and all the rest pertaining to the relation of these two to each other seemed to him to belong among the idle questions of the schools. Cœlestius had several audiences with the Roman bishop himself, and always explained himself to the satisfaction of the latter. Add to this, that the two bishops, Heros and Lazarus, by whom the complaints had been brought against Pelagius at the council of Diospolis, were well known to him as turbulent, mischievous men; and accordingly, the whole affair would the more readily appear to him as a mere ebullition of passion, the less he understood of its real nature. Besides, Pelagius had accompanied his letter to Rome with a letter from the bishop Praylus of Jerusalem, by whom he was completely justified.

Accordingly, Zosimus wrote to the North-African bishops on the affair of Pelagius and Cœlestius two letters, which must have struck these bishops with some surprise, expressing, as they did, a judgment so entirely different from that of his predecessor. He reproaches them for not having entered into a careful examination of this matter, and for having so easily given credit to the charges of trifling and mischievous men. He gave the most decided testimony to the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Cœlestius. Of Pelagius' letter he said it agreed

* *Præter fidem quæstiones. Si forte ut hominibus quispiam ignorantie error obrepsit, vestra sententia corrigatur.*

† See Augustin. de peccato originali, c. 5, 6, et 23.

wholly with the oral declarations of Cœlestius. "Would that some one of you," he writes to the bishops, "had been present when the letter was read! How rejoiced and surprised were all the pious men who heard it! Scarcely could some refrain from tears to find that men so thoroughly orthodox* could yet be made objects of suspicion. Was there a single passage in the letter where grace or the divine assistance was not mentioned?"† It would appear, then, that Zosimus, when he heard the words grace and divine assistance so often repeated, had never even thought of any different determination of the conceptions associated with those words; and that it seemed to him in the highest degree unjust that those who expressed themselves after this manner should be accused of denying grace. He gave the North-African bishops to understand that they had gone over the limits which should be assigned to the doctrines of faith, and raised a controversy on questions which had no connection whatever with the faith. He had reminded Cœlestius, he wrote, and the priests from various countries who were present, that such knotty and moot points, and such foolish disputes had sprung from that pestilent contagion of an idle curiosity, then spreading on all sides, which led each man to misemploy his mind, and his uncontrolled power of speech in affecting to know more than holy scripture revealed. He entreated them, in the name and authority of the apostolic see, that they would submit their reason to the Bible, as it was explained according to the tradition of the fathers. In his first letter, relating only to Cœlestius, he decided that either an accuser must appear in person at Rome, within the space of two months, who could show that Cœlestius thought differently from what he had expressed in his own declarations, or that for the future no one should presume to call in question his orthodoxy after such manifest proofs of it.

It may be easily understood that a man who could so express himself must have differed widely from the doctrines of Augustin, although he did not precisely agree in all respects with the Pelagian system, nor perhaps accurately understand it; and, in fact, may not have had any exact knowledge of doctrinal matters at all. Nothing is easier than to suppose that

* Tales etiam absolutæ fidei.

† Estne ullus locus, in quo Dei gratia vel adjutorium prætermissum sit?

Zosimus was one of those Roman ecclesiastics who sought to make themselves familiar only with the liturgical forms and practical business of the church, but took no interest in theological studies; and in this case it would admit of being readily explained how, without any independent theological judgment of his own, he was liable to be governed by the influence of others, as at present by the influence of the Pelagian party existing in Rome.*

The North-African bishops, accustomed already, in less important matters, to assert their independence in opposition to the arrogant claims of the Roman bishops, to a supreme judicial authority, had no inclination to sacrifice a doctrinal conviction of so much weight to themselves to the arbitrary decision of a man in whom the inherited authority of a successor of the apostle Peter was to supply the place of a theological judgment resting on its own independent grounds. Accordingly, they addressed to the Roman bishop, in the name of a council assembled at Carthage, a letter, in which, probably with all professions of respect, they protested against his decision.† They gave Zosimus to understand that he had too easily allowed himself to be deceived by the vague declarations of Cœlestius. • The decided language of these bishops, combined with many other powerful influences from without, had already produced such an effect, that Zosimus began to assume another tone, although he was quite careful not to recede in the least from his claims to supreme judicial authority. In a second letter he praised, indeed, anew the decisive authority of the apostolic chair, and defended himself against the reproach of lightness and overhaste in his investigations and decisions; yet he already ceases to make further mention of what he had said in his earlier letters in favour of Pelagius and of Cœlestius; and, in compliance with the request of the Africans, he suspended the final decision of the matter until after further examination. The North-African bishops, however, were not at

* See the edict of the emperor Honorius, hereafter to be cited.

† It is to be lamented that this letter has not reached us; and we can only surmise its contents from the answer given to it by Zosimus. Zosimus mentions, in his letter, an *obtestatio* which the North-African bishops had sent to Rome. Many learned men have supposed, that by this was meant the letter sent at an earlier period by the bishops to Innocent; but it is much more probable that the *obtestatio* contained in the latter letter of the Africans, which is lost, ought here to be understood.

all inclined to wait for a foreign decision. They anticipated this by a decision on their own part. At an assembly held at Carthage, in year 418, they drew up nine canons, in which the doctrines relating to the moral condition of human nature, concerning grace and free-will, and concerning baptism, were defined and settled in a way opposed to the system of Pelagius. In this document were expressed the doctrines of the corruption of human nature by the sin of the first man ; of death as the punishment of sin ; of grace as an inward communication of the divine life, from which alone all truly good actions could spring. The fourth canon asserts : " Let him be accursed who says the grace of God, by virtue of which we are justified through Christ, refers merely to the forgiveness of past sins, and not to assistance to secure us against falling under sin for the future." V. : " Who teaches that this grace helps us to keep from sinning, only so far as it opens our minds to a knowledge of the divine commands, so that we are made acquainted with what we must strive after, and what we must avoid ; but that it does not bestow on us a disposition to love, and a faculty to practise such commands. For whereas the apostle says, ' Knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth,' it would be very impious to believe that we have the grace of Christ in order to that which puffeth up, but not in order to that which edifieth ; while, in truth, both are the gift of God, not only that we know what we must do, but also that we love it in order to do it ; that so where love edifieth, knowledge may not puff up." Furthermore, in the sixth canon the tenet was condemned, that grace merely renders more easy the fulfilment of that which could also be fulfilled without it. In opposition to this view, it was alleged that Christ had not said, " Without me ye would find it more difficult to do anything ; but without me ye can do nothing." John xv. 5.

But as the Roman bishop had so preponderant an influence in the Western church, and as his influence could effect so much even at the imperial court, it became necessary for the Africans to secure betimes their ground in that quarter, and to endeavour to gain over the supreme civil power against Zosimus. According to Augustin's principles—as we have already explained them in the history of the Donatist controversy—no hesitation ought to be felt, but it should rather be considered a duty, to call upon the civil power to repress un-

Christian errors. The connection of Augustin with the count Valerius may doubtless have contributed to procure the interposition of the civil power in this present case; as, in fact, Augustin himself, in a controversial tract relating to these matters, which he dedicated to Valerius, intimates that the latter had deserved well of the truth for his exertions in this cause.*

Accordingly, from the year 418 and onward, there appeared several edicts, couched in a style more theological than imperial, against Pelagius and Cœlestius, and their adherents.†

The bishop Zosimus was not decided enough in his theological views and character to be able to maintain his ground against such authorities; and besides this, he was, no doubt, closely pressed at home by a powerful anti-Pelagian party, which had long maintained itself in the conflict with the other side. Constantius, a man of some rank, who had left the post of Vicar of Rome (*vicarius urbis*), and become a monk, stood at the head of the former party.‡ Cœlestius was now to ap-

* De nuptiis et concupiscentia, l. l. c. i. s. 3. Profanis istis novitatibus, quibus hic disputando resistimus, tu potestate curando et instando efficaciter restitisti. By this Augustin drew upon himself from the Pelagian Julian the deserved reproach, that, as his party could not maintain their cause by reasons, they sought to supply this defect by a resort to outward force. Quam nihil habeant, quod vi qua proteruntur rationis opponant, ut alia eorum scripta, ita hi testantur libelli, qui directi ad militarem virum (quod etiam ipse profiteri potest) aliis magis negotiis quam literis occupatum, impotentia contra nos precantur auxilium. Augustin, however, does not deny that he had applied to the civil power in aid of this object; he only thought he had no reason to be ashamed for so doing. He speaks of it with confidence and assurance, as if conscious of having done nothing but what was right: "Non impotentia contra vos precamur auxilium; sed pro vobis potius, ut ab ausu sacrilego cohibeamini, Christiana potentia laudamus officium."

† Two of these edicts, one of them addressed to the bishop Aurelius of Carthage, seem to have been issued at the request of the North-African bishops. Moreover, the remarks of the Pelagian Julian presuppose that such a law had been enacted in answer to the petition of the North Africans: but he imagines he can interpret it to the advantage of his party; as may be gathered from the words of Augustin, l. III. c. Julian c. i. s. 3. Sane, ut dicis, si pro vobis potius ab imperatore responsum est. But then, it cannot possibly be conceived, how Julian could have given any such interpretation to one of the laws which has come down to us. It is very probable, therefore, that the law intended is one which has not reached our times.

‡ Prosper, in his chronicle, under the twelfth consulate of Honorius, says: Constantius servus Christi ex vicario Romæ habitans, et pro gratia Dei devotissime Pelagianis resistens, factione eorundem multa pertulit.

pear before the Roman bishop, and sustain a new examination; but he doubtless foresaw the result, and hastily left Rome. Upon this Zosimus issued a circular letter (*tractoria*), in which he pronounced sentence of condemnation on Cœlestius and Pelagius; adopted the decisions of the council of Carthage against the Pelagian doctrines; and declared himself on the doctrines of the corruption of human nature, of grace, and of baptism, in accordance with the views of the North-African church. Not without reason might the Pelagians accuse Zosimus and the Roman clergy, who had before shown themselves so favourable to the cause of Pelagius, of denying the convictions they had previously avowed, no matter whether it was ignorance, the force of authority, or the fear of man, which had chiefly contributed to produce this change.*

When thus, through the authority of the Western emperor and of a Roman bishop wanting in independence, Pelagianism had been condemned, the circular letter of Zosimus was sent to the whole church of the West, and all bishops were required to subscribe it, in its condemnation both of the doctrine, and also of the persons of Pelagius and Cœlestius.† Those bishops who declined were to be deprived of their places, and banished from their churches;‡ a sentence which was rigorously exe-

Julian says to his opponents (*opus imperfect. l. III. c. 35*), *Cur tantis totam Italiam factionibus commovistis? Cur seditiones Romæ conductis populis excitastis?* And even though this must be considered as the accusation of a passionate opponent, yet there must be some truth lying at the bottom here.

* Julian accuses Zosimus of prevarication. *Augustin. c. Julian. Pelagian. l. VI. s. 37*. He says of the Roman clergy: *Eos jussionis terrore percussos non erubuisse prævaricationis crimen admittere, ut contra priorem sententiam suam, qua gestis catholico dogmati adfuerant (since they were present at that assembly held under Zosimus, which had declared so favourably to the cause of Pelagius and Cœlestius), pronuntiarent.* *Augustin. contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum. l. II. s. 5*.

† Marius Mercator, in his *commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii*, says of this circular: *Per totum orbem missa subscriptionibus sanctorum patrum est roborata.*

‡ See the letter of the bishop Aurelius of Carthage to the bishops of two North-African provinces, in which letter he calls upon those who had not given their signatures at the council of Carthage, to do it now, so that no room might be left for suspicion against any one: *Quo cum in supradictorum hæreticorum damnatione omnium vestrum fuerit integra subscriptio, nihil omnino sit unde ullius vel dissimulationis vel negligentiae vel occultae forsitan pravitatis aliqua videatur merito remansisse suspicio.*

outed, particularly in Italy, where Pelagianism had many adherents, and in North Africa.

Eighteen bishops of Italy who met this fate complain, not without reason, in a letter composed by the bishop Julian of Eclanum, and addressed to the bishop Rufus of Thessalonica, that, without the convocation of a synod, subscriptions were extorted, separately and individually, from the ignorant bishops, of whom there were so many at that time in the Western church.* Several bishops in the department of Aquileja, from whom their metropolitan Augustin, the bishop of this town, demanded their subscriptions, sent to him a covertly Pelagian confession of faith,† drawn out in detail, declaring that their conscience did not allow them to condemn Pelagius and Cœlestius, persons who were absent, and whom they had not heard in their own defence;‡ and they appealed to a general council. But many, who had resigned their places for the sake of their convictions, afterwards testified repentance, and were accordingly restored again to their spiritual charges;§ though the sincerity of their repentance may well be questioned. On the other hand, the bishop Julian, of Eclanum in Apulia, a man whose scientific attainments and pious life had acquired for him universal respect, distinguished himself by his zeal and courage in standing up for the defence of what he deemed to be Christian truth. In predominantly leaning to the side of the practical understanding, his intellectual bent resembled that of Pelagius and Cœlestius. He unfolded their doctrines in the most systematic form. He appears to have been a more passionate man than his predecessors; but we should not forget the oppressed condition of his party.|| In spite of the imposing authority which the supe-

* In *tota penitus occidente* non minus stultum quam impium dogma esse susceptum et simplicibus episcopis sine congregatione synodi in locis suis sedentibus ad hoc confirmandum subscriptionem extortam. The words cited in Augustin's letter of refutation, addressed to the Roman bishop Boniface, contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, l. IV. s. 20.

† To be found, along with some others, in the appendix to the tenth volume of the Benedicte edition of Augustin.

‡ Metuimus in absentem et nobis inauditorum capita dictare sententiam, nisi cum præsentibus fuerint confutati.

§ Marius Mercator commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii, c. v.

|| Even Augustin esteemed him highly when a young man. See his ep. 101 to Julian's father, the Apulian bishop Memorius.

riority of his intellect had procured for Augustin in the Western church; in spite of the authority which the bishops of Rome derived from their outward position; in spite of the imperial verdict of condemnation, Julian, the banished bishop, in various writings defended his principles with a freedom reckless of consequences, and in a spirit and style of language which would have well befitted the leader of a dominant party. By his zeal, his scientific gifts, and his exemplary life, he was enabled to secure adherents to his principles. A person who belonged to the party of his adversaries reports that in a time of famine he devoted his entire property to deeds of benevolence. To be sure, in the judgment of his opponents, there could be no honest intention in this act of a heretic: it was only a means to gain himself followers.*

With deserved indignation, showing the sentiments of a noble mind, Julian rebukes the cowardice of those of his own faith who supposed, as he expresses it, that true discretion consisted in purchasing, by the servility of a degenerate soul, the insecure repose of a moment.† He says of them, that, in the worldliness of their own spirit, they accused of contention and obstinacy those who preferred to suffer any evil rather than to give up their convictions. Had there been a frank and manly bearing among the bishops, he thinks public opinion would as certainly have declared against the delusion of the Traductionists, as invincible reason destroyed it. In order to the defence of truth, science and courage (*scientia et fortitudo*) must be united; neither is of any avail without the other.‡

Not without reason might Julian complain of the oppressive measures against the adherents of the Pelagian doctrines; not without reason might he complain that Pelagian and Cœlestian had been coined into heretical names wherewith to terrify the ignorant multitude, and that the latter were constituted judges on points which they were not competent to understand.§ He

* See Gennadius de V. I. c. 45. That Julian acted as the organ of a party, is seen from *opus imperfect.* l. I. c. 51, where he says, it had been entrusted to him by *sanctis viris nostri temporis confessoribus* (these of course were the confessors of Pelagianism) to write against Augustin.

† *Nihil magis cautis convenire consiliis, quam degeneris animi famulatu emere vel infidam momentorum quietem.*

‡ *Opus imperfect.* c. Julian. at the beginning,

§ *Quod Cœlestianorum vel Pelagianorum nomine homines terreamus,* l. II. c. Julianum, s. 34. That it was endeavoured to stir up against

demanded, on the contrary, that wise and judicious men should be chosen out of all ranks and professions, whether ecclesiastics or civilians, to investigate the question: such as, though few in number, might yet be distinguished for reason, scientific cultivation, and freedom of spirit.* He complained that the guidance of the church had been wrested from reason, in order that a doctrine which recommended itself to the people might have liberty to spread everywhere without check or hindrance.† He objects to his opponents, that they used every means to prevent freedom of inquiry, by calling in the secular power; for they felt themselves obliged to resort to force, because they were deserted by reason.‡ Augustin, on the other hand, proceeding on his own principles of ecclesiastical law, which we have already explained, and his idea of the church, appealed to the authority of the church, which had already decided the question, and to the legitimate power of the magistracy, which is bound to punish the propagators of error in the same manner as other evil-doers. “Wouldst thou have no fear of the magistracy?” says he to him, “Then do what is right. But there is nothing right in maintaining a heretical, in opposition to the apostolic doctrine. The heresy which the bishops have already condemned needs no longer to be examined, but should be checked by the power of a Christian magistracy.”§ Julian constantly made his appeal to “reason,” which alone should examine and decide on all questions; but this reason assuredly had to do only with universal conceptions. From mere reason it was impossible to understand what was meant by original sin, the need of redemption, and redemption itself. The subject-matter of these conceptions could be understood only from

them homines de plebeia fæce sellulariorum, milites, scholasticos auditores, nautas, tabernarios, etc.

* *Paucitas quam ratio, eruditio libertasque sublimat*, c. Julian. l. II. s. 36.

† *Eripiuntur ecclesiæ gubernacula rationis, ut erecto cornu velificet dogma populare*, c. Julian. opus imperfectum, l. II. c. 2.

‡ *Quod omnibus opibus negationem examinis a mundi potestatibus comparatis, intelligitis enim, agendum vobis vi esse, cum deserimini rationis auxilio*. L. c. c. 103.

§ *Vis non timere potestatem? bonum fac. Non est autem bonum, contra apostolicum sensum exserere et asserere hæreticum sensum. Dæmnata ergo hæresis ab episcopis non adhuc examinanda, sed cœrcenda est a potestatibus Christianis*. L. c.

the actual experience of the soul. Had Julian consistently followed out his "reason," he must have gone a great deal farther in his negations. Augustin could oppose to him the consciousness of the Christian church, which was not first made to be such by this or that bishop, but which was found already present by all as the one which existed from the beginning. And the objection that the doctrine was a *popular* one, and agreeable to the people, he does not repel, but admits the statement to be true; contending that it is not so much an objection as a commendation, that the doctrine which responds to the consciousness of the Christian church should be distinctly marked. "Such a people," says he, "Ambrose did not *make*, but he *found*. We admit our doctrine is a doctrine of the people; for we are the people of Him who was for this reason called Jesus, because he redeemed his people from their sins."* And Julian himself, on another occasion, agrees with Augustin in attaching importance to the popular consciousness, when he appeals from the authority of the church, and from what appeared to him to be an arbitrary imposition of doctrinal subtleties, to the same consciousness; though not indeed to the peculiar subject-matter of the Christian consciousness, but to the foundation of the universal sense of God; which itself, however, without the influence of Christianity, could not have been so clearly developed. He who on other occasions was so used to refer to the learned and to the more cultivated minds, referred also to the *simple*, who, being occupied with the cares of business, had received nothing from the schools, yet by faith alone had sought to attain to the church of Christ. He advised them not to allow themselves to be disturbed by dark questions; but, while they believed God to be the true Creator of men, to believe without wavering also, that he is a good, a true, and a just being; and while they held fast their conviction of this Trinity, they might admit and approve everything which they heard agreeing with this idea, while they should let no force of argument deprive them of this, but might repudiate every authority and every party which sought to convince them of the contrary.†

* *Tales populos non fecit, sed invenit Ambrosius; fatemur dogma nostrum esse popolare, quia populus ejus sumus qui propterea est appellatus Jesus, quia salvum fecit populum suum a peccatis eorum. L.c. c. 2.*

† *Simplicis, qui aliis occupati negotiis nihil de eruditione ceperunt*

The principles of Pelagianism rigidly carried out, would have gone to the extreme of denying altogether man's need of redemption, consequently, of making Christ wholly superfluous; hence, of giving an entirely new shape to the church doctrine concerning Christ. Yet, though these principles were not unfolded with this rigid consistency, they could not fail, if but applied, so far as they were unfolded, with a clear consciousness of their import and with logical closeness, to beget a theory of the person of Christ of a peculiar stamp, and corresponding to the principles themselves. This connection, however, never betrayed itself in the way in which Pelagius and Cœlestius were accustomed to present their scheme, for only the disputed questions respecting the character of man were deemed of importance by them; on all other points they adopted the common doctrines, receiving them without alteration, and without examining how far they harmonized with their fundamental positions. Yet we have seen already, in the case of Theodore of Mopsuestia, how closely his peculiar views of man, the relation of which to the (in many respects) kindred Pelagian views we shall consider more at large hereafter; how closely his doctrine of human freedom was connected with his peculiar notions respecting the character and work of Christ. A trace of this connection we perceive in Julian of Eclanum, who objects to his opponents, that, if they did not suppose a human nature in Christ subjected to the seductions of sense and to temptation, as in other men, but derived every thing of a moral nature in him only from a natural necessity, they could not suppose in him any true human virtue, nor recognize him as a moral example for mankind.* The same connection also would be very apparent in a man who, near the commencement of the fifth century, was called a follower of the Pelagian doctrines, if indeed he was rightly so named.

sola tamen fide ad ecclesiam Christi pervenire curarunt, ne facile obscuris quæstionibus terreantur, sed credentes, etc. Nec hoc eis ulla vis argumentationis evellat, sed detestentur omnem auctoritatem atque omnem societatem contraria persuadere nitentem. C. Julian, l. V. §. 4.

* Ut omnis virtutum pulchritudo quam in se Christus expresserat, indebitis naturæ ejus laudibus vacuata flaccesceret, cunctoque veritatis suæ splendore nudata sacrum magisterium mediatoris offeret irrisui. *Opus imperfect. l. IV. c. 50.*

We mean Leporius, a monk and presbyter in the south of France.*

Leporius is said to have been condemned in his native country on account of his Pelagian tenets, and in consequence of this to have emigrated, with several of his followers, in 426, to North Africa; but at Carthage he was convinced by several bishops, chiefly perhaps by Augustin, that he was in an error. The bishops by whom he had been convinced, commended him to the paternal gentleness of their Gallic colleagues, in a letter accompanying the recantation of Leporius. In this recantation, he calls God to witness, that he had supposed his error to be the truth; that a well-meant zeal, though without knowledge, had deceived him. This introduction is suited to inspire confidence in the sincerity of his recantation; but, from many things which he says in this document, it is difficult to believe that a man who, in his earlier doctrine concerning the person of Christ, discovers a tendency of mind so near akin to that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, would now pass to a mode of expression so opposite, and pushed even to the extreme of crassness, as exhibits itself in many passages of this recantation. But perfectly ignorant as we are of what, in the meanwhile, had been working within the breast of this individual, we can come to no further determination on this subject.

In the above-mentioned recantation, drawn up by Leporius, no traces are to be found of Pelagian doctrines; but the heretical matter in his doctrines would seem, according to this, to have consisted simply in a view of Christ's person, agreeing, in all respects, with the principles of the Antiochian school. Like Theodore, he opposed the confounding of the predicates of the two natures. "It was not God himself who was born as man, but a perfect man was born with God." On the other hand, he now said, in his recantation: "I believe thoroughly that God is unable to do only what he does not will to do. If God willed to be born, as he assuredly did, I firmly believe also that he could be born; since God's essence is subject to no limitation." Like Theodore, he had distinguished from each other the different senses in which Christ is called the Son of God according to the two natures, the proper Son of God

* He is called a Pelagian by Cassian, *de incarnatione Christi*, lib. I. c. 4; and Gennadius, *de v. J. c.* 59.

according to his divine, and the adopted Son of God according to his human nature.* He likewise supposed, as did Theodore, a progressive revelation of the deity, in the human nature associated with it, up to the time of Christ's resurrection.† He conceived of Christ, in his temptations and sufferings, as a man left to himself, so that by his efforts, his obedience, his merits, his constancy, he achieved for himself that higher state which began with his resurrection.‡ He also maintained with Theodore, that omniscience was not to be ascribed to our Saviour as man, and that the ignorance which he professed with respect to the time of the final judgment was to be understood in the literal sense.

If we might believe, then, that account which represents Leporius to have been a Pelagian, it might very easily be explained how he must have evolved his doctrine concerning the nature of Christ out of his doctrine concerning man; but the singularity in this case would be, that the bishops of Carthage, who looked upon the opposition to everything Pelagian as so important, should have required no recantation from Leporius on these points. We might from this circumstance be led, to conjecture that the Pelagianism with which he was charged had been imputed to him only by inference; or we must suppose that two epochs are to be assumed in the history of the progress of Leporius in forming his doctrinal system, which Cassian and Gennadius have neglected to notice: the first, when he was a Pelagian; next, when he was induced to subscribe the circular letter of Zosimus, and no longer appeared as so open an advocate of Pelagianism. But his Pelagianism, which had been merely suppressed, had subsequently led him to the peculiar doctrines which he maintained concerning the person of Christ, which he supposed he might teach, without infringing on the doctrines of the church, since, in fact, previous to the outbreak of the Nestorian controversies, a great deal on this subject was still vague and undefined.

Among the zealous defenders of the Pelagian doctrines, deserves to be particularly mentioned, Annianus, deacon of the

* *Filius Dei proprius—et adoptivus.*

† *As may be gathered from the antithesis in the recantation: Nec quasi per gradus et tempora proficientem in Deum, alterius status ante resurrectionem, alterius post resurrectionem fuisse credamus.*

‡ *Laborem, devotionem meritum, fidem.*

church at Celeda (perhaps in Italy).^{*} By the decision of Zosimus, already mentioned, he was most probably obliged to resign his spiritual charge; but he continued to exert an active influence in favour of the principles of the persecuted party, to which he gloried in belonging.[†] He believed that he was contending for the cause of morality, which, by the doctrines of the Traducianists, was exposed to the utmost peril,[‡]—and for the cause of moral freedom, the recognition of which distinguished Christianity from Paganism, where sin was palliated by charging it on natural necessity and fate.[§] Believing that he found in the prevailingly moral interest evinced by Chrysostom, in the manner in which he attacked the excuses pleaded by moral remissness, in the manner in which he stood up in defence of free-will along with grace,^{||} a great deal which, being akin to his own views, admitted also of being opposed to the principles of the Traducianists and the new Manicheans,[¶] he translated the homilies of Chrysostom on the gospel of Matthew,^{**} and his homilies in praise of the apostle Paul, into Latin; and accompanied these translations with dedications to his Pelagian friends, in which he very plainly avowed his own principles.^{††}

Various offshoots from the Pelagian party continued to propagate themselves in Italy, down to the middle of the fifth century; and the Roman bishop, Leo the Great, had occasion once more to remind the bishops, that no ecclesiastic belonging to the Pelagian party, could be re-admitted to the communion

^{*} See Hieronym. ep. 81 ad Alypium et Augustinum, where he is cited as a friend of Pelagius, and author of a violent controversial tract.

[†] In the dedication to Orontius, one of the deposed Pelagian bishops: Inter has, quas pro fidei vobiscum amore perpetimur tentationum procellas.

[‡] Per occasionem quarundam nimis difficilium quæstionum ædificationi morum atque ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ satis insolenter obstrepitur.

[§] Ingenitæ nobis a Deo libertatis decus, cujus confessio præcipuum inter nos gentilesque discrimen est.

^{||} See below, the development of his system.

[¶] Non enim est in alterutro (doctrine concerning grace or free will) aut incautus annianus; sed in utroque moderatus. Pro evangelica perfectione nobiscum pugnare videtur. Videtur non tam præsentis informasse discipulos, quam nobis contra veræ fidei oppugnationem auxilia præparasse.

^{**} Only his translation of eight homilies has come down to our times.

^{††} See opp. Chrysostomi ed. Montfaucon. T. II. et T. VII.

of the church without a very distinct recantation, and without expressly subscribing all the decisions of the church, in opposition to its doctrines. As late as the close of the fifth century, an aged bishop named Seneca appeared in Italy, who ventured publicly to defend doctrines akin to Pelagianism, and, in fact, to excommunicate a presbyter who contradicted them. It is impossible, however, from the letter, written in passion, which the Roman bishop Gelasius issued against him, to determine with certainty whether he really stood in any outward connection with the Pelagian party, or whether perhaps, as an unlearned man, and (if what Gelasius says is true) without knowing anything about Pelagius, while supposing himself to be perfectly orthodox, he had been forced, in opposing the doctrine of original sin in its stiffest form, and the doctrine of the damnation of infants, so revolting to all sound feelings, to hazard many assertions closely bordering on Pelagianism.*

If now we glance back at the result of these disputes in the Western church, it certainly cannot be denied, that as well here as in the doctrinal controversies of the Oriental church, it was no free development of the opposite sides which had brought about that result; but Pelagianism had succumbed to an outward force, which hindered it from freely expressing itself. At the same time, however, a great difference is manifest between the cause of these disputes, and of those in the Oriental church. It was not the shifts and intrigues of a theological party, which, mixing up secular and spiritual interests, contrived to connect itself with the court; but it was the superior intellect of an individual, actuated solely by zeal for what he considered to be sacred truth, which, controlling the minds around it, succeeded by their means to make the civil power subservient to his own convictions. And although a few men of independent minds were obliged to yield to force and to numbers, yet the doctrine, which in this case gained the victory, was not, as so frequently happened in the Oriental church, a doctrine forced upon the natural development of the church by the secular power, and therefore to be followed at some subsequent period by a violent reaction; but that doctrine conquered which had on its side the voice of the

* See the documents in the appendix to the tenth volume of the Benedictine edition of Augustin.

universal Christian consciousness, since this declared itself against the Pelagian tendency: the doctrine conquered which found a ready point of union in the whole life and experience of the church, as expressed in its prayers and in all its liturgical forms. Hence also it followed, that although Pelagianism had been conquered, rather by suppression than by free evolution, yet there was no violent reaction on this side. But, for this very reason, the system of Augustin, as will hereafter appear, could not so easily succeed in establishing its claims to validity on another side of it, where this system itself came in collision with a higher inward power, with a conviction hitherto dominant in the great majority of minds, and which in fact struck its roots in the depths of the Christian life and consciousness.

We will then, in the first place, before proceeding farther to develop the history, bring more distinctly to view what has just been stated, by contemplating more nearly the inner relation to each other of the conflicting views which here present themselves, and the manner in which the conflict was carried on between them. And first, in respect to the importance of the disputed questions of which we here speak, in their bearing on the Christian system of faith; Pelagius, it is true, and especially Coelestius,* sought to lower the importance of the points in dispute, as if all differences here might be reduced to mere diversities of speculative opinion, which had nothing to do with faith. But to this course they were led by their relation to the dominant party in the church; since for the present their only anxiety was that they might be allowed freely to express their own peculiar principles, as others were allowed to express the opposite ones. For a different course was pursued by the ardent and untrammelled bishop Julian of Eclanum, who, after being spurned from the dominant church, had no further cause to seek after a reconciliation of differences. He denounces,† in the strongest terms, those of his party who, in yielding from outward motives to the party in power, consoled themselves with the reflection,‡ that this dispute had

* See above, his trial at Carthage, and his letter to the Roman bishop. Pp. 309, 310.

† *Opus imperfectum Augustini contra Julianum*, l. V. c. ii. et seq. and l. VI. c. 1.

‡ *Ejusmodi opinionem hactenus super nostro fuisse certamine, ut ad questionem involutam magis quam ad summam spectare fidei crederetur.*

nothing to do with the essentials of faith, but related merely to obscure questions in which faith was but slightly concerned. He maintained, on the contrary, that the highest object of Christian faith itself, the doctrine concerning God, was essentially concerned here; for the Traducianists* and the Catholics did not agree even in their doctrine concerning God. The God of the Traducianists was not the God of the gospel; for since they taught that human nature is, from the birth upwards, tainted with sin, and since they declared concupiscence itself to be sin, they denied either that God is the creator of man's nature, and made Satan its author, and consequently fell into Manicheism, or they made God himself to be the author of sin; and in teaching that God was a being who punished unavoidable sin, and who arbitrarily assigned the destinies of woe or of bliss, they impinged upon his moral attributes of holiness and justice. On the other side, Augustin did not concede to Cœlestius, that this dispute was so unimportant in its bearing on doctrines; for as the acknowledgment of the doctrine of a Redeemer and a redemption, in which consisted the essence of Christianity, presupposed the acknowledgment of a need of redemption, hence this doctrine was closely connected with the doctrine of the corruption of man's nature, and accordingly with the doctrine of the first sin and its consequences; and the former fundamental doctrine, without this presupposition, lost its significance. On the contrast, therefore, between Adam and Christ, rested the essence of Christianity.† Among the Pelagians, accordingly, the predominant polemical interest was the interest in behalf of the universal idea of a religious moral sense, in a form, however, in which it could not have developed itself without Christianity; while, with Augustin, the predominant interest was in behalf of that which constitutes the more peculiar essence of the Christian consciousness.

As, in this controversy, several matters, standing closely connected together in the Christian system of faith, were brought into the discussion, the question now forces itself

* As he denominated the defenders of the doctrine of original sin, accusing them of maintaining that sin was propagated by generation, the *propagatio peccati per traducem*.

† *In causa duorum hominum, quorum per unum venundati sumus sub peccato, per alterum redimimur a peccatis. proprie fides Christiana consistit.* Augustin. *de peccato originali*, s. 28.

upon us, whether perhaps all the individual differences which here presented themselves to view might not be reduced to one fundamental difference in the mode of religious apprehension, from which, as the original source, all the others proceeded. But if, in examining doctrinal controversies generally, we should ourselves distinguish what is set forth with clear consciousness by the contending parties as the fundamental point of difference, and the still more general and more recondite opposition, to which this fundamental difference admits of being reduced, though the contending parties, who have not traced the opposition to its ultimate grounds, are not conscious of any such thing—it is of the more importance to make a distinction in the present case—because the convictions of those who defended the Pelagian doctrines had grown out of a practical interest, while they stood on the common ground of a system which had been handed down to them, and against which they had no intention whatever to contend. Furthermore, we must distinguish what is original and what derived in the generic development out of the life within, out of the Christian consciousness, and what stands in the same relation of original and derived in the speculative conceptions of the understanding.

If we are contented to receive as true what was constantly expressed with clear consciousness by both the parties themselves, it must seem that the dispute properly started from the different modes of contemplating human nature in its present condition, or more particularly, from different notions with regard to the relation in which the moral condition of the later race stands to the sin of the first man ; for everything else that came into the discussion, the different notions respecting man's need of help, respecting the nature of the redemption, respecting the work of Christ and the operation of Christianity, respecting the object and the effects of baptism,—all this was closely connected with the fundamental difference above mentioned. Augustin, in fact, was continually falling back upon the position, that man found himself in a state of corruption ; and, on the other hand, this was the point to which the denial of the Pelagians particularly referred. Moreover, in the development of the religious consciousness, this will constitute the most original and the most important difference of all, namely, in what relation man places himself to God and

Christ, whether in the relation of one who needs help and redemption, or not; and in what degree of strength this consciousness manifests itself.

At the same time, however, we meet with many disputed points which do not admit of being thus traced back to this fundamental difference. On the contrary, differences of the two systems in individual points are to be met with, from which *that very disputed point itself* which was prominently set forth by the *disputants* as the most *universal of all*, admits of being derived.

Accordingly, we find here, in the first place, a different mode of apprehending *one conception*, of great importance on account of its bearing on the system of religion and morals, which did not proceed from the different modes of apprehending the present state of human nature, but rather lay at the foundation of these different views themselves. We mean the different ways of apprehending the doctrine concerning the freedom of the human will. In the Pelagian system, moral freedom is apprehended as a freedom of choice; as the faculty of deciding at each moment alike between good and evil; of choosing one of the two for its determinations. This is the fruitful root which, according to the different bent of the will, produces good or evil.* On the other hand, Augustin says, such an indifference, such an equipendency between evil and good, from whence man is able at each moment alike to decide in favour of the one or the other,† is a thing utterly inconceivable. Man is already determined within himself by his disposition, before he proceeds to act. Evil and good cannot spring from the same root. The good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor the evil tree good fruit. The root from which all good proceeds is love to God; the root of all evil is

* The words of Pelagius in the first book of his work *de libero arbitrio*: *Habemus possibilitatem utriusque partis a Deo insitam, velut quandam, ut ita dicam, radicem fructiferam, quæ ex voluntate hominis diversa gignat, et quæ possit ad proprii cultoris arbitrium vel nitere flore virtutum vel sentibus horrere vitiorum.* Augustin. *de gratia Christi contra Pelagium et Cœlestium*, s. 19. With this, Julian agrees in several passages cited by Augustin. *Opus imperfectum*, l. V. et VI.

† As Augustin aptly describes it in his work against Julian: *Libra tua, quam conaris ex utraque parte per æqualia momenta suspendere, ut voluntas quantum est ad malum, tantum etiam sit ad bonum libera.* *Opus imperfectum*, c. Julian. l. III. c. 117.

love to self. According as man is predominantly actuated by love to God, or love to himself, he brings to pass that which is good or that which is evil.* That definition of free-will, he maintains, cannot apply to God, nor to holy beings † It, in fact, presupposes a corruption of the moral powers, and loses its applicability the more in proportion as man advances farther in moral development, in proportion as he approaches to true freedom. At the highest point of moral advancement, freedom and necessity meet together; ‡ the rational being acts with freedom, in determining himself according to the inward law of his moral nature. Since evil is that which is at variance with the original essence of the rational creature—that which is not grounded in nature, but which contradicts nature; it follows that that which, in the Pelagian definition, is regarded as the characteristic mark of moral freedom, already presupposes a corruption of the moral nature, as sin exercises over it a power of attraction which it ought not to exercise.

With this difference was connected still other important differences. Proceeding on the above-stated more ideal and material § conception of freedom, Augustin must believe that he found in the actual appearance of human nature an opposition to the freedom which was so apprehended, inasmuch as this true conception of freedom is in this case nowhere applicable. Man uniformly finds himself in a state contradicting this freedom, in a condition of bondage to sin. Thus this determinate conception of freedom leads Augustin to the presupposition of a corruption of human nature, and of an original moral condition which preceded it; and cohering also with this is the thought, that, when once this original freedom had been disturbed by the first freely chosen aberration from the law of the original nature, a state of bondage followed after the state of freedom. As human nature, evolving itself in conformity with its condition by nature, surrendering itself to the godlike, becomes continually more confirmed and established in true freedom; so, in surrendering itself to sin, it

* Comp. Augustin. l. c. de gratia Christi. Aliud est caritas, radix bonorum, aliud cupiditas, radix malorum; tantumque inter se differunt, quantum virtus et vitium.

† C. Julian. imperfect. l. VI. c. 10.

‡ The beata necessitas boni, as opposed to the misera necessitas mali.

§ As distinguished from "formal."

becomes continually more involved in the bondage of sin, to which Augustin frequently applies the words of Christ: "He who commits sin is the servant of sin." Evil is its own punishment, as goodness is its own reward. On the other hand, Pelagius and his adherents found no cause, inasmuch as they proceeded on that more formal and empirical conception of freedom, to suppose any corruption of the moral nature, and any different original condition of it. With the essence of freedom, the possibility of evil as well as of good is for them, in and of itself, already supposed. This possibility belongs to the essence of human nature, and is hence something inalienable. The question, Whence comes sin? is therefore not to be entertained. That man who, having it at each moment in his power to choose the good as well as the evil, chooses the evil, has no other cause for this than his momentary self-determination, else he would not be free. When, therefore, even the Pelagians were constrained by an outward authority to adopt the opinion of an original moral state, of a first man and of a first sin as a fact, yet it is clear that this opinion could stand in no inner connection with their anthropological system as a whole; that they, on the contrary, remained indifferent to it; for, according to their presupposition of moral freedom, apprehended as above described, the moral condition of human nature could suffer no essential change: the same faculty of choice between good and evil continued still to exist.

In connection with this stands another doctrinal conclusion. Pelagius places human nature, furnished by God as its creator with the moral faculty, in the middle, between good and evil; but Augustin considers human nature either as existing in its original state, in communion with the original source of goodness, freely serving it as its natural organ, or estranged from the higher power of goodness, whose organ human nature was destined to be, and enslaved by the foreign power of evil. The moral faculties of man point, according to Augustin, to the original fountain of good, from which alone all goodness can flow—to God, communion with whom is the supreme good of beings endowed with reason, and without whose communion nothing exists but evil. The following antithesis, therefore, presents itself: Life in communion with God, the divine life, the supremacy of goodness, nature subordinated to grace; and, on the other side, estrangement from God by a

bent of will fallen from the supreme good, self-love, sin. The Pelagian idea of freedom, on the contrary, admits of no such divine principle of life, transforming and ennobling man's nature, nor of any systematically grounded opposition between nature and grace. God has provided human nature with all the capacities and powers requisite to the fulfilment of its destination, and so also with moral powers for the practical exercise of all goodness. This unchangeable faculty is the work of God alone. It belongs only to man that he should by his will apply these powers bestowed on him by his Creator, and thereby become what God has destined him to be. The ability is from God; the act of willing and being from man.*

But Augustin does not suppose, like Pelagius, that man, after having been once endowed by the Creator with reason and free-will, the capacities for the knowledge and practical exercise of goodness, was then wholly left to himself in the application of them; but he supposes man also, in this latter respect, to be still in absolute and constant dependence on God as the sole original source of all being, all truth and goodness. The capacities of the rational creature are not anything complete and self-sufficient by themselves, but only organs to receive, to appropriate, and to reveal what is communicated to them by fellowship with that absolute source of truth and goodness. Just as the eye stands in a certain co-relation to the sun, so reason stands in co-relation to God.† By this principle he was necessarily led to conceive that *all* rational beings, and not man alone, are dependent on grace (*gratia*, the inward revelation and communication of God, the community of the divine life), in order to the attainment of their destined end. And it follows from this that, according to Augustin, this dependence does not first proceed from the vitiation of man's moral nature, but was originally implanted

* Pelagius, quoted by Augustin de *gratia Christi*, c. iv. *Primum illud, id esse posse, ad Deum proprie pertinet, qui illud creaturæ suæ contulit; duo vero reliqua, hoc est velle et esse, ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt.*

† *e. g.* Augustin's words: *Sicut corporis oculus non adjuvatur a luce, ut ab eadem luce clausus aversusque discedat, ut autem videat, adjuvatur ab ea, neque hoc omnino, nisi illa adjuverit, potest: ita Deus, qui lux est hominis interioris, adjuvat nostræ mentis obtutum, ut non secundum nostram sed secundum ejus justitiam boni aliquid operemur. De peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. II. s. 5.*

in this, in like manner as in the nature of all the rational creatures of God. God is the absolute spirit, whose will is law—without whose fellowship, without whose support and assistance, no creaturely spirit, whether angel or man, can persevere in goodness, in the sound and healthful development of his essential being, which is akin to the divine. Had not such support and aid been bestowed on the angels, and on the first man, their apostacy from God would have involved no guilt. They would have wanted the requisite means for persevering in the original state.* It was first to be made manifest, in the development of rational creatures, what the free-will was capable of doing by itself; in order that, if it should show itself worthy of such a reward, the higher power of grace might supervene to ennoble rational creatures, and conduct them onward to their perfection. Thus the angels, forasmuch as they remained faithful by their free-will to the divine grace, attained to that higher measure of grace, by virtue of which they were made secure against ever falling—to the immutability of the divine life—to that fullness of love which admits no intrusion of the selfish principle. To the same dignity the first man would also have attained, had he fulfilled that condition, and remained true to God by the bent of his free-will.†

Thus we arrive here at a difference which is not to be traced to different notions respecting the present condition of human nature, but which precedes it; although this difference was made more prominent by the more speculative and systematic mind of Augustin than it was by the Pelagians, who

* Si hoc adjutorium vel angelo vel homini, cum primum facti sunt, defuisset, quoniam non talis natura facta erat, ut sine divino adjutorio posset manere si vellet, non utique sua culpa cecedissent, adjutorium quippe defuisset, sine quo manere non possent. Augustin. de corruptione et gratia, s. 32.

† Deum sic ordinasse angelorum et hominum vitam, ut in ea prius ostenderet, quid posset eorum liberum arbitrium, deinde quid posset suæ gratiæ beneficium. The end which the good angels attained by the persevering bent of their will—donec istam summæ beatitudinis plenitudinem* tanquam præmium ipsius permansionis acciperent, id est, ut magna per Spiritum Sanctum data abundantia caritatis Dei, cadere ulterius omnino non possent, et hoc de se certissime nossent. And of the first man: In quo statu recto et sine vitio, si per ipsum liberum arbitrium manere voluisset, profecto sine ullo mortis et infelicitatis experimento acciperet illam merito hujus permansionis beatitudinis plenitudinem. L. c. s. 27, 28.

did not lay so deep the foundations of their theory ; a different view of man's relation to God in the original state itself, inasmuch as man, even in this state, was dependant on God's grace, which he could appropriate with his own free-will, and through which alone he could fulfil all goodness.* The different way in which the present state of human nature was regarded, originated in a different mode of apprehending the relation of the rational creature to God ; of the natural to the supernatural. While the rigid prosecution of the Pelagian principles to their consequences left no foothold whatever for the recognition of anything supernatural ; in the system of Augustin, on the contrary, the point of union for the supernatural element is given from the outset. According to his conception, such is the nature of the rational spirit, that it can find nowhere, but in surrendering itself to a supernatural, godlike element, its true life, the realization of its destiny. And his views in this respect correspond to that which was expressed by the older church-teachers concerning the relation of the image of God to likeness with God. Now from these views, as its foundation, resulted the doctrine of Augustin, that since man, by his free-will, became estranged from God, the original fountain of all good, this free-will, left to itself, was now only active to sin ; and that he needed a new supervenient grace, in order to be brought back to goodness ; so that it was at this point the question arose which came into discussion in the dispute between the two parties.

But we may reduce this difference again still farther back to a difference in the mode of apprehending the relation of the creation to the Creator, although this difference did not actually come into discussion in the controversy. Pelagianism was based on the view that when God had once created the world, and provided it with all the powers requisite for its preservation and development, he permitted it to go on with the powers bestowed on it, and according to the laws implanted in it ; so that the continuous operation of the divine agency was with reference only to the preservation of the powers and capacities, but not to any

* Augustin. *de corruptione et gratia*, s. 31. *Habuit primus homo gratiam, in qua si permanere vellet, nunquam malus esset, et sine qua etiam cum libero arbitrio bonus esse non posset. Liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit; ad bonum autem parum est, nisi adjuvetur ab omnipotenti bono.*

concursus in order to their development and exercise. * Augustin, on the other hand, conceives God's agency of preservation as a continual creation, and the life and activity of the creatures, collectively and individually, as depending on the almighty and omnipresent agency of God, and conditioned thereon; standing in absolute dependence upon it at each moment.*

Although this difference was not generally brought to notice and dwelt upon in this controversy, yet Jerome perceived that the whole matter was to be reduced to this, and he laid it as a charge against the Pelagians that they denied the absolute dependence of the creature on the Creator; that they placed man on a level with God by this independence, which they attributed to him in reference to his actions; and opposed to them the words of Christ in John v. 17, respecting God's agency in the creation, which is never at rest, but always putting forth.† And, in a certain sense, it may unquestionably be affirmed, that not only in its development under the form of conceptions, this difference is the most original one, but that we have also presented here the most original fundamental

* e. g., Augustin's words: Deus, cujus occulta potentia cuncta penetrans incontaminabili præsentia facit esse quicquid aliquo modo est, in quantumcunque est, quia nisi faciente illo non tale vel tale esset; sed prorsus esse non posset. *De civitate Dei*, l. XIII. c. 26.

† Hieronymus in epistola ad Ctesiphontem. Istiusmodi homines per liberum arbitrium non homines propriæ voluntatis sed Dei potentia, factos se esse jactitant, qui nullius ope indigent. Sciamus nos nihil esse nisi quod donavit, in nobis ipse servaverit. Joh. v. 17. Non mihi sufficit, quod semel donavit, nisi semper donaverit. Audite, quæso, audite sacrilegum (now if the succeeding clause were really said of the Pelagians, it would follow, that even the Pelagians themselves had brought this disputed point more clearly to consciousness): Si veluero curvare digitum, movere manum, sedere, stare, etc.; semper mihi auxilium Dei necessarium erit? This antithesis is also distinctly set forth by Orosius: Non in solo naturali bono generaliter universis unam gratiam tributam; sed speciatim quotidie per tempora, per dies per momenta, per atomas et cunctis et singulis ministrari. Dicit enim scriptura, "qui facit solem oriri super bonos et malos." At tu forte respondes: "*Ordinem suum composita bene natura custodit; ac per hoc Deus elementariis semel cursibus constitutis, facit inde quæ jactat.* Quid ergo de illa sententiæ parte, quæ sequitur, opinaris? Dat pluviam super justos et injustos." Utique qui dat cum vult dat, et ubi vult dat, vel dispensando dispositam constitutionem, vel effundendo propriam largitatem.— See Orosii apologia de arbitrii libertate, ed. Havercamp. p. 607. Compare also the language of the Roman bishop Innocent, cited above, p. 319.

difference, as it respects the position of the religious consciousness ; for the shape which the religious consciousness takes in relation to God as Redeemer, certainly presupposes the shape which the same consciousness takes in relation to God as Creator. The general consciousness of absolute dependence on God is the most original of all, and the whole diversity of religious life depends ultimately on the fact how that consciousness has unfolded and shaped itself.

This difference in fundamental ideas, if it was expressed and applied with clear consciousness, must have had for its consequence an important difference in the views entertained respecting the progress of humanity, and respecting the nature of revelation and redemption ; but it was very far from being the case, that Pelagius, Cœlestius, or Julian, were distinctly and fully conscious to themselves of the principles lying at the basis of their tenets, and of all the consequences which flowed from them. They came to their principles, not by impartial reflection, proceeding solely from a scientific interest, on the principles of the system of faith, but by a polemic interest in behalf of practical Christianity ; and they applied these principles only to just the extent which this interest called for, as the following history will more fully show.

From what has been said, it follows that the views entertained by Augustin and by the Pelagians respecting the state of the first man, the character of the first sin and its consequences, must have widely differed from each other, although both parties professed to derive their views from the same source of information—the narrative in Genesis ; and, moreover, both parties agreed with each other in their principles of interpretation, and in the mode of applying these principles, and more particularly in the literal method of exposition. Such an opposition as is supposed in the system of Augustin, between the original nature of the first man while as yet disturbed by no moral schism, and the nature of his posterity involved in this schism, could not appear in the Pelagian system ; for, according to the latter, human nature has, in fact, in its spiritual and moral capacities, ever continued to be the same. All men find themselves, till they have personally sinned, in the same innocence in which Adam lived before the first transgression. The Pelagians, like the older, particularly the Oriental church-teachers, with whom they, in fact, more espe-

cially coincided; compare the state of the first man with that of an innocent, inexperienced child; only with this difference, that, as a thing necessary in order to his preservation, his spiritual and corporeal powers were already unfolded to a certain extent. From this, the Pelagian Julian would also explain the first transgression, and—as the interest of his system required, in order to be able to represent the supposition of such mischievous consequences of it to entire humanity as the more untenable—would make it to appear an altogether trivial matter, the disobedience of a thoughtless child, easily exposed to be carried away by the allurements of sense. God gave the first man a command, for the purpose of bringing him to a consciousness of his moral capacities and of his freedom. This command was a simple one, as the powers of the infantile age demanded: he required of him a proof of child-like obedience.* But inexperienced and thoughtless, as he had not yet learned to fear, nor seen any example of virtue,† he allowed himself to be enticed by the agreeable aspect of the forbidden fruit, and to be determined by the persuasion of the woman. This excitement of concupiscence was, in itself considered, nothing wrong: it belongs to man's sensuous nature, which he has in common with the brutes, and it moreover proceeds from the Creator himself.‡ It was only the act of allowing the will to be led wrong, and, in compliance with the solicitations of sense, transgressing the divine command, which is to be called sin. Augustin, on the other hand, conceived that there was this great difference between the state of the first man and all that followed him, that he lived in undisturbed communion with God, for which he was destined; that, by this circumstance, all the powers of his nature were enhanced: the higher and the lower working together in perfect harmony. The human body was not, it is true, as yet equal to the glorified body which we are to receive after the resurrection; but, inasmuch as no schism as yet existed in human nature, it was, without resistance, the subservient organ of the soul, governed and directed by the Spirit of God; and man, if he had remained true to the divine will, would have passed

* *Interdictu unius pomuli testimonium devotionis expetitur.*

† *Radis, imperitus, incautus, sine experimento timoris, sine exemplo justitiæ.*

‡ *Contr. Julian. opus imperfect. IV. 38.*

immediately, without the violent transition of death, to a higher unchangeable, and imperishable existence. Thus, according to the views of Augustin, the importance of the first transgression did not lie in the outward character of the act, in itself considered, nor in the kind of object to which it referred. Augustin, as a moral teacher, generally possessed this great merit, as we have already remarked on other occasions, that he took his stand against the quantitative estimation which contradicts the true standard of morality, and gave prominence rather to the essential thing of the disposition. The magnitude of the guilt consisted precisely in this, that man, when he was not as yet living in the moral bondage under which his posterity suffer, transgressed with free-will the law of God. The explanation of the fact from the solicitations of sense, Augustin could not admit. Such a temptation implied already the inward corruption; such a conflict between the flesh and the spirit could not arise in that seat of peace. The will of man subordinated to the divine will, kept even the senses in obedience, as organs subservient to the soul. It was only after man, by the inward act, by the opposition of self-love, of self-will against the divine will, had fallen from the latter—and so, in consequence of this, the cause of all other discord had made its appearance—that the seductions of sense could lead him astray to transgression of the divine law.* Hence it was that the discord now extended itself into all parts of human nature: hence all physical and moral evils, and death as the punishment of sin. All this was transmitted from the first man to his posterity. As, in the first man, the love of self, which appeared in opposition to the divine will, is the source and principle of all sin, so is it also in the case of the whole race. First from this proceeds concupiscence, striving contrary to the law of reason; and on account of this conflict, which the Pelagians regarded as something inseparable from the human organism, and therefore, in itself considered, excusable, Augustin called it sinful. It was not sense, in itself considered, but the power which sensuous desires, of whatever kind, exercised over the spirit of man, destined for a higher kind of life, the conflict between the sensual and the spiritual, which ap-

* In paradiso ab animo cœpit elatio, et ad præceptum transgrediendum inde consensio. Augustin. c. Julian. l. V. s. 17.

peared to him to be a consequence of that original schism, and as something sinful—it was this that he understood under the term “concupiscence.”* But his elevated mind, longing after the free life of the spirit, was also inclined to see in every sensual desire affecting the man, in so far as it re-acted upon the soul, disturbing and checking it in its pure spiritual life, a mark of that self-procured bondage.† As Augustin started from the ideal of a reason ruling over sense, and in everything that stood opposed to this natural supremacy, beheld a manifestation and a result of that internal schism, it was accordingly an unjust charge laid against him by the Pelagians, when they accused him of holding, like a Manichean, that the flesh and its affections are sinful in themselves, and proceed from an evil principle. To Julian, who derived the power of the sinful desires from nature, which man had in common with the brutes, Augustin replied, that man, in the following respect, could not be compared with the brutes: in the case of the latter, there could be no conflict between the flesh and spirit; but man was bound to govern his sensuous nature by the spirit. That, through the power of his sensuous impulses not dependent on his reasonable will, he had come to be on a level with the brutes, is the very consequence of that first schism between the human and the divine will.‡

But now Augustin supposed, not only that this bondage under the principle of sin, by which sin is its own punishment, was transmitted by the progenitor of the human race to his posterity; but also that the first transgression, as an act, was to be imputed to the whole human race,—that the guilt and the penalty§ were propagated from one to all. This participation of all in Adam's transgression, Augustin made clear to his own mind in this way: Adam was the representative of

* Not the sentiendi vivacitas, but the libido sentiendi, quæ nos ad sentiendum, sive consentientes mente sive repugnantes, appetitu carnalis voluptatis impellit, c. Julian. l. IV. s. 66.

† Quis autem mente sobrius non mallet, si fieri posset, sine ulla mordaci voluptate carnali, vel arida sumere alimenta, vel humida, sicut summus hæc æria?

‡ Fatere secundum Christianam fidem, etiam istam esse hominis pœnam, quod comparatus est pecoribus insensatis et similis factus est iis. Carnis concupiscentis homini est pœna, non bestię, in qua nunquam caro adversus spiritum concupiscit. Opus imperfect. c. Julian. IV. 38.

§ Propagatio reatus et pœnæ.

the whole race, and bore in himself the entire human nature and kind in the germ, since it was from him it unfolded, itself.* And this theory would easily blend with Augustin's speculative form of thought, as he had appropriated to himself the Platonico-Aristotelian Realism in the doctrine of general conceptions, and conceived of general conceptions as the original types of the kind realized in individual things. Furthermore, his slight acquaintance with the Greek language, and his habit of reading the holy scriptures in the Latin translation, led him to find a confirmation of his theory in a falsely translated passage of the epistle to the Romans, v. 12.† It may indeed be a question, whether, even if he had had access to the New Testament in the original language, his doctrinal prejudices would not have deprived him of the sense to discern the simple meaning of that passage. But, at all events, the influence of Augustin's peculiar philosophical form of thought, as well as the influence of his narrow principles of exegesis, on the formation of this doctrine, should not be rated too high; for his whole mode of apprehending the matter had a still deeper ground in his Christian consciousness.

Pelagius and his followers, on the other hand, denied all those physical and moral consequences of the transgression of the first man on the entire race, which had been asserted by Augustin. The imputation of another's guilt conflicts with the justice of God; the propagation of guilt conflicts with the idea of sin and of free-will; sin is not a thing of nature, but only self-determination of the free-will; hence it cannot be transmitted from one to another. "Even the individual," says Julian, "cannot, by means of a simple transgression, suffer a change in his moral nature; he retains the same freedom of the will. The past sin no longer injured the first man, when he had repented of it; how, then, was it possible that the entire human nature should be corrupted thereby?" The proposition of Augustin, that sin punished itself by moral bondage, that sinfulness was at one and the same time the fountain of other sins and the penalty of sin, this proposition was so far from

* *e.g.* de peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. III. c. 7. In Adam omnes tunc peccaverunt, quando in ejus natura, illa insita vi, qua eos gignere poterat, adhuc omnes illi unus fuerunt.

† The phrase, in quo omnes peccaverunt, where he refers the in quo to Adam.

being intelligible to Julian, that he looked upon it as blasphemy—as if God punished sin by plunging men into still other sins.* The Pelagians would only admit that Adam had injured his posterity by his example; and in this way they explained all those passages in the New Testament which speak of a connection between the first transgression and the sins of the entire race.† But, as it regards physical evils and death, Pelagius and his followers, especially Julian, who explained and unfolded this view, endeavoured to show, that all this had from the beginning been implanted by the Creator in the essence of man's physical organization, and that, by the destination and historic development of human nature, it could not be otherwise. Pelagius understood those passages in the epistle to the Romans which speak of death as the punishment of sin, as referring to spiritual death.‡

The question concerning the propagation of a sinful nature would easily connect itself with the question which had been

* See c. Julian. op. imperfect. IV. c. 5. The deep passage in Rom. i. 28, concerning the action and reaction of moral and intellectual blindness, which Augustin had adduced in proof of his proposition, this passage Julian was so little prepared to understand, that he did not hesitate to explain away the whole depth of the thought by the supposition of a hyperbolical metonymy. To express his abhorrence of such sins, the apostle had said, as it were: *Non tam reos quam damnatos sibi tales videri*. Yet Augustin was enabled to show Julian, that the latter himself had been obliged to say something similar to the thought, which in another form he found so revolting, quoting the words of Julian: *Iustissime enim sibi bonus homo et malus committitur, ut et bonus se fruatur et malus se ipsi patiatur*. C. Julian. I. V. s. 35.

† It had been easy for Julian to refute Augustin's explanation of the *propter quod*; and to show that it should be understood in the sense of *propter quod*; but it had been equally easy for Augustin to expose the idleness of that explanation of the whole sense, by which it was made to refer simply to the example given by Adam. C. Julian. I. VI. s. 75. The apostle—Julian supposed—mentioned Adam alone, and not Adam and Eve together, though both had sinned, on purpose that men might have their minds directed solely to the effect of a given example, and not to a propagation of sin by generation. C. Julian. op. imperfect. II. 56.

‡ On Rom. v. 12, Pelagius says: *Nunc apostolus mortem animæ significat, quia Adam prævaricans mortuus est, sicut et propheta dicit: Anima quæ peccat, ipsa morietur. Transivit enim et in omnes homines, qui naturalem legem prævaricati sunt*. How important he considered it, that the matter should be so understood, appears from a remark on Rom. viii. 12: *Manifeste nunc ostendit, quia non de communi et naturali morte superius fecerit mentionem*.

so much discussed since the times of Tertullian and Origen, respecting the origin and propagation of souls. We have seen already how Cœlestius availed himself of this connection for the purpose of removing both the questions from the whole province of matters pertaining to the interest of faith and of church doctrine, and to place them in the category of subjects where a difference of opinion might exist without infringing on the unity of faith. On the other hand, Augustin sought, in this case, to separate that which was important as doctrine, that which was securely grounded in the teachings of sacred scripture and in the connected system of Christian truth, from that which was rather matter of speculation, and on which scripture gives no certain decision. He was not to be moved from the conviction that sin and guilt had spread from the first man to all, and he was equally sure that every scheme which conflicted with this presupposition could not be otherwise than false. But yet he did not venture to decide, whether *Creationism* or *Traducianism* was to be adopted as the true theory; although he was well aware what advantages the latter theory would give to his own system, and although this same theory, since the time of Tertullian, had by many in the Western church been combined with the doctrine of the propagation of a sinful nature. Probably he was deterred, by the apprehension lest he might fall with Tertullian into sensuous representations of the nature of the soul, from deciding in favour of a theory which in other respects must have been so inviting to him. On the other hand, he doubtless perceived also the difficulties which Creationism left unexplained in his system of faith. The reason which Jerome advanced in favour of this view, drawn from the never-resting but continually operating creative agency of God, according to John v. 17,* appeared to him to be no sufficient evidence; for he could allege, on the contrary, that, in the case of all propagation in nature, the continual creative agency of God was, in like manner, presupposed.† Sacred scripture appeared to him to furnish a certain warrant for no particular scheme whatever; and accordingly he ended with confessing his ignorance—a confession

* See Hieronymus contra errores Joannis Hierosolomytani, vol. IV. ed. Martiany, f. 310.

† De anima et ejus origine, l. I. s. 26. Ipse quippe Deus dat, etiamsi de propagine dat.

which, to a man of his speculative intellect, must assuredly be an instance of great self-denial. "Where scripture gives no certain testimony," he argued, "human presumption must beware how it decides either in favour of one side or the other. If it were necessary for man's salvation to know anything on these points, the scripture would be more explicit on them."*

Although the Pelagians denied that there was any such thing as hereditary corruption of human nature, yet they agreed with Augustin in recognizing the maxim of experience, that sin in humanity continually acquired greater dominion; they adopted the opinion of a progressive deterioration of mankind, and upon this they argued the necessity of counteracting influences by the various revelations of God, and the various means of grace which God had employed. This deterioration they explained, as in the case of humanity at large, so in the case of individual men, from the force of bad customs, by means of which evil had become a second nature.† Yet, at the same time, since human nature comes into the world in its original purity, and no foreign principle dwells within it; this phenomenon, of which experience testifies, is nothing but an accident. There may be exceptions from this general rule: persons, who by developing the powers of their moral nature by virtue of their free-will, have lived to the end in perfect holiness. In his public declarations (see above), Pelagius,

* De peccatorum remissione, l. II. s. 59. A young man in Mauritania Cæsariensis, Vincentius Victor, was displeased with this confession of ignorance on the part of so eminent a church-teacher as Augustin. He wrote against him a work, in which, professing with his limited understanding to comprehend everything, he uttered many absurd and obscure things; and he had the boldness to apply to Augustin the words of Ps. xlviii. 13, according to the Vulgate: *Homo in honore positus non intellexit; comparatus est pecoribus insensatis et similis factus est illis*. Augustin says to him, in the work which he composed in refutation of this production, *de anima et ejus origine* (l. I. s. 26): *Istam autem non ego vicissim, quasi rependens maledictum pro maledicto, pecoribus comparo: sed tanquam filium moneo, ut quod nescit se nescire fateatur, neque id quod nondum didicit, docere moliatur*.

† *Epistola ad Demetriadem*, c. 8. *Longa consuetudo vitiorum, quæ nos infecit a parvo paulatimque, per multos corruptit annos, et ita postea obligatos sibi et addictos tenet, ut vim quodammodo videatur habere naturæ*. Accordingly, they explained the passage concerning the law in the members (Rom. vii.) as referring to this influence of bad habits. See the words of Pelagius, in Augustin. *de gratia Christi*, s. 43, and of Julian, in the *opus imperfectum*, l. I. c. 67.

it is true, would never express himself distinctly on this point; but, in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, he says, remarking on the passage in v. 12, the word "all" is to be understood here as referring only to those who had sinned like Adam, and not to such as Abel, Isaac, and Jacob: the apostle says *all*, because, compared with the multitude of sinners, the few righteous amount to nothing. In his work on the free-will, he cited many examples of men and women from the Bible; and, availing himself of the already predominant superstitious veneration of Mary, he argued from her example, who was to be denominated sinless, that she must have been perfectly righteous.* In other times he thought, when the number of mankind was already large, it would doubtless have been impossible to enumerate the sins of every individual; and we should not be authorized therefore to infer their non-existence from their not being mentioned. But the case was different with the first beginning of the human race, when there were but four individuals in existence: and then the book of Genesis mentions the sins of three among the four; but none of the fourth, namely, Abel. Hence it may be inferred that he was without sin. By this conclusion we should abide, and not assert what is not asserted in the sacred scriptures.† A way of reasoning quite characteristic of Pelagius!

True, according to what has been above remarked, the fundamental principles of Pelagianism would necessarily lead to the theory of a complete development of humanity in harmony with nature within the sphere of its laws, and to a denial of all interposition on the part of God; but Pelagius and his friends ever remained strangers to this further extension of their prin-

* Augustin. de natura et gratia contra Pelagium, s. 42. Quam dicit sine peccato confiteri necesse esse pietati. As, however, he could not prove, from any declaration of scripture, that those whom he named were to be represented as saints, he had recourse to the singular argument: De illis, quorum justitiæ meminit (scriptura sacra) et peccatorum sine dubio meminisset, si qua eos peccasse sensisset.

† Certe primo in tempore quatuor tantum homines fuisse referuntur: peccavit Eva, scriptura hoc prodidit; Adam quoque deliquit, eadem scriptura non tacuit: sed et Cain peccasse, ipsa æque scriptura testata est; quorum non modo peccata, verum etiam peccatorum indicat qualitatem. Quod si et Abel peccasset, et hoc sine dubio scriptura dixisset; sed non dixit, ergo nec ille peccavit, quin etiam justum ostendit. Credamus igitur quod legimus, et quod non legimus, nefas credamus adstruere. De natura et gratia, s. 44.

ciples. Although the doctrine of God's supernatural communications had no such place in the Pelagian system as it had in the system of Augustin, by reason of the doctrines systematically unfolded by Augustin respecting the relation of the creature to the Creator, and respecting man's corruption; yet, even in the Pelagian system, that doctrine found a point of attachment in the recognition of a moral degeneracy of human nature in general, and in its idea, and of the truth that human nature, as a thing created, could and should arrive at a degree of completeness and perfection beyond the measure of the capacities originally implanted in it by the Creator, by free manifestations of the divine love. True, the Pelagians made no such distinction, and no such opposition, between nature and grace as Augustin did; and inasmuch as they did not hesitate to apply the latter term to designate *all* communications of the love of God, they moreover sometimes embraced together, under the general conception of "grace," all the moral and spiritual powers which God has conferred on human nature; but they did not, on this account, by any means deny that there were supernatural communications of the love of God, through which there had been bestowed on man's nature what it never could have attained by means of the powers communicated to it by creation; and they applied the term "grace" to both, as well to God's gifts embraced under that connection, as to those that went beyond it. Thus they applied the notion grace to all the revelations of God in the Old and in the New Testament; in the law, and in the gospel. Sometimes, too, they referred it solely to that which has been bestowed on mankind by Christ; as when Pelagius said that the power of free-will is in all—Christians, Jews, and Pagans; but that in Christians alone it is upheld by grace.* They suppose, in reference to the above-mentioned counteracting influences of the divine means of salvation against the moral degeneracy of mankind, different stages of righteousness: first, the knowledge of God from reason, and the law of right living, as it was written, not in letters, but on the heart—the stage of righteousness according to nature (*justitia ex natura*); next, the *revelation* of the positive law, designed to rekindle again

* In omnibus est liberum arbitrium æqualiter per naturam; sed in solis Christianis juvatur a gratia. Augustin. de gratia Christi, s. 33.

the law of nature, which had been darkened by corruption—righteousness under the law (*justitia sub lege*). But when the custom of sin became predominant, and the law was inadequate to remove the evil, then came Christ himself, to heal the malady now become as it were desperate; and that, not by means of his disciples alone, but by his own intermediate interposition.*

The Pelagian Julian, in defending himself against the charge that, according to their opinion, the free-will sufficed for the worship of God, says that although God, as the Creator of the world, might have been known by natural reason, yet the latter was in no wise capable of arriving, by itself, at the knowledge of the mysteries of faith, as, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity, of the resurrection, and many other similar doctrines.†

Julian insisted only that between the revelation of God in the sacred scriptures and the eternal truths which he had implanted in reason there could be no contradiction; that, in particular, the sacred scriptures could contain nothing which conflicted with the ideas of a holy and just God, which was inseparable from the very sense of a divine being. From the sacred scriptures, therefore, nothing could be proved which was opposed to these universal and eternal ideas of reason; much rather, must all the difficulties and obscurities in single passages be so explained as to harmonize with these ideas of God, which flowed from the clear, collective contents of the sacred writings, and with those rational ideas.‡ Yet, in this

* *De peccato originali*, s. 30.

† *Opus imperfectum*. c. Julian. l. III. c. 106. It is well to notice the vague conception which Julian had of the cultus Dei—how the ethical and dogmatic elements, the moral act and a theoretical knowledge of certain isolated maxims of faith, are here placed together, without a hint of any inward connection between the two, of any central point in the inner life out of which both proceeded. As Augustin's conception of "grace" was alien from him, it was necessarily the case that the conception would also be foreign from him of any such higher unity as a divine principle of life bestows, in giving a new shape and direction to the entire religious and moral consciousness. Julian's words are: *Cum enim cultus Dei multis intelligatur modis, et in custodia mandatorum, et in execratione vitiorum, et in ordine mysteriorum, et in profunditate dogmatum quæ de Trinitate, vel de resurrectione, multisque aliis similibus fides Christiana consequitur.*

‡ In the first book of the *opus imperfectum*, Julian says: *Nihil per*

fundamental principle, there was, in itself considered, no essential difference between Julian and Augustin; for the latter, too, would not admit that there was any real contradiction between faith and reason (*fides et ratio*). At the same time, the Pelagians would not have consented to the principle of Augustin, respecting the way in which faith precedes reason, and the latter is evolved out of the former.

Pelagius and his followers, in their doctrine concerning grace, were particularly strenuous only in maintaining its *opposition* to any theory which impaired the freedom of the will. They supposed all operations of grace to be conditioned on the bent of the free-will, and all means of grace to be effectual only according to the measure of the different tendencies of will; they denied all constraining influences of grace on the free-will. Augustin, on the other hand, reckoned it as necessary to the conception of grace that it should exclude all merit; and with this belonged, in his own view, all conditioning of grace on the different states of recipiency on the part of man. Just as soon as the whole was not referred to God's efficiency alone, just as soon as anything was made to depend on the different ways in which men stood related to the efficiency of God, the idea of grace is annihilated; for that which is bestowed on the ground of merit is no longer grace. *This* point of the opposition, namely, to any and every theory which impaired the free-will, was the only one which the Pelagians here brought prominently to view; but, in fact, their opposition doubtless carried them still further. They were in

legem Dei agi potest contra Deum legis auctorem. By this *unum compendium*, every assertion which conflicted with the recognition of God's holiness or justice could be at once set aside. Correct interpretation must serve to solve any such apparent contradiction; for wherever anything really contradictory appeared it ought to be rejected as not belonging to the sacred scriptures. *Ambigua quæque legis verba secundum hoc esse intelligenda, quod absolutissimis scripturæ s. auctoritatibus et insuperabili ratione firmatur.* In another passage, *Secundum id quod et ratio perspicua et aliorum locorum, in quibus non est ambiguitas, splendor aperuerit.* In another place, l. II. c. 144, he makes the recognition of the scriptures as holy, to rest, not on outward tradition, but on their agreement with reason and with the essence of the Christian faith, and on the morality of their contents: *Sanctas apostoli esse paginas confitemur, non ob aliud, nisi quia rationi, pietati, fidei congruentes erudiunt nos, et Deum credere inviolabilis æquitatis et præceptis ejus moderationem, prudentiam, justitiam vindicare.*

strictness really inclined, whenever they designated the supernatural by the term grace, to understand thereby simply outward revelations, communication of certain specific knowledge which transcended the powers of natural reason. More foreign to them was the notion of an internal communication of divine life, of an internal influence of God on man's will and consciousness. Although, among their manifold and vague declarations respecting the term grace, they also said a great deal which bordered on that last-mentioned character of the Augustinian conception, and although they never stood forth in a distinct and clearly-conceived opposition to it; still, however, the thought may have floated before them that, by the concession of any such internal influence of God whatever, the free-will of man would be impaired. Had they believed that they might really agree with Augustin in acknowledging this character without altering their difference in respect to the doctrine of free-will, it would in truth have been so natural for them distinctly to express this, as Augustin often attacked them on this very point, that, even though they acknowledged a supernatural revelation and communication of knowledge, we must suppose they denied *this peculiar characteristic*. But in such cases they always retreated under the cloud of a multitude of vague references to the means of grace, by which the free-will was upheld, for the purpose of showing, by this exuberance of expressions, how very far they were from denying "grace." "God upholds us," says Pelagius,* "by his instructions and his revelation; by opening the eyes of our heart; by revealing to us visions of the future life, that we may not be carried away with the things of the present; by discovering to us the arts of the adversary; by enlightening us by means of various and ineffable gifts of the heavenly grace."† The very important passage in favour of the Augustinian doctrine in Philipp. ii. 13, "It is God that worketh in us to will and to do," Pelagius‡ explains as meaning only, "He works in us to will what is good and holy, when he consumes what is offered to our earthly desires by the greatness of the future glory, and the promise of rewards; when he excites the prayerful will to longing after God by the revelation of his wisdom,

* In Augustin. de gratia Christi, c. vii.

† Dum nos multiformi et ineffabili dono gratiæ cœlestis illuminat.

‡ C. 10.

when he counsels us to all goodness." Thus Julian also says that God helps by commanding, blessing, sanctifying, chastizing, inviting, enlightening.*

On the other hand, Augustin sets forth prominently only that one character on which all depends. The revelation of the law can, in itself considered, give man no help, as he wants the power to fulfil the law. The revelation of the law could only serve to awaken in him the feeling of the need of the grace whereby alone he could acquire the power to fulfil the law. Love is the fulfilling of the law; but the love of God comes not from the law, but is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.† Only in so far could Augustin apply his conception of grace, which he denominated the peculiarly Christian conception, to all that the Pelagians said concerning revelation and divine instruction, as these terms were supposed to denote, not merely the conception of an outward revelation, and outward instruction, by the written word, but an internal revelation by the inward working of God on the inner life and consciousness of man, a living knowledge and recognition of the matter revealed, proceeding out of a new divine life.‡

Connected with this difference in respect to the *doctrine concerning grace* was another in respect to the *doctrine concerning Christ*, as the Redeemer of mankind, and respecting the redemption. The *negative* reference of the work of redemption must, it is true, in the Pelagian system have been restricted to a narrow compass: since no such corruption of the entire human nature, as according to Augustin's doctrine flowed from the transgression of the first man, was here admitted. But still, even in this system, the redemption might be held as set over against the above-mentioned gradual deterioration of man, and the force of habit; and in this case the Pelagians needed only to adopt here, as they did elsewhere, the views peculiar to the Oriental church. In the latter, redemption was contemplated, not alone as a restoring of the *corrupted* human nature

* Opus imperfect. III. 114. Præcipiendo, benedicendo, sanctificando, coercendo, provocando, illuminando.

† Proinde per legem gratia demonstratur, ut lex per gratiam compleatur.

‡ Hæc gratia, si doctrina dicenda est, certe sic dicatur, ut altius et interius eam Deus cum ineffabili suavitate credatur infundere per se ipsum De gratia Christi, c. 14.

to health and freedom, but still more as an *exalting, ennobling, and transfiguring* of the imperfect, limited human nature to a condition beyond the point at which it was placed by the original creation, and beyond the powers which were then bestowed on it. And so the Pelagians did actually suppose that the human nature which God created good originally, was by Christ made still better; raised to a higher stage of advancement, which consists in Sonship to God; furnished with new powers; and assured of a state of felicity resulting from adoption into the kingdom of God, to the attainment of which the powers of nature are inadequate.* At the same time, however, this notion of the exaltation and renewal of human nature through Christ could not, in the Pelagian system, be apprehended in all its depth; and, as we have seen, the idea of a communication of divine life through Christ had no place in this scheme of doctrine.

In the Pelagian system, Christ appears as the divine teacher, who reveals truths to the knowledge of which human reason could not by itself have attained. In his precepts and life, he revealed the most perfect system of morals: he gave to all the most perfect pattern of holiness.† As the Pelagians held that Adam had injured his posterity by the first example of sin in humanity, so now they opposed to this the perfect example of virtue given by Christ.‡ But we must allow that, according to the Pelagian system, no exclusive merit could really be pointed out as belonging in this case to Christ; for, according to this system (see above, p. 353) there were even before Christ persons who perfectly kept the moral law. The Pelagian Julian, therefore, found no other way of getting along here, than by supposing a difference of degree; maintaining that Christ, though he had not given the first, had yet presented the highest pattern of righteousness §—a mode of expression

* The words of Julian are: *Christus, qui est sui operis redemptor, augeat circa imaginem suam continua largitate beneficia, et quos fecerat condendo bonos, facit innovando adoptandoque meliores.* Augustin. c. Julian l. III. s. 8.

† *Exacta in Christo justitiæ norma resplenduit. Opus imperfectum, l. II. s. 188.*

‡ *Sicut ille peccati, ita hic justitiæ forma.*

§ *Justitiæ forma non prima, sed maxima: quia et ante quam verbum caro fieret, ex ea fide, quæ in Deum erat, et in prophetis et in multis aliis sanctis fulsere virtutes.*

to which none but such illogical thinkers as the Pelagians could have resorted. And even in this case, in order to come at any clear and distinct meaning, it is necessary to suppose that, according to the Pelagian doctrine, there was something still more perfect than the mere fulfilment of the law, namely, works of moral perfection which exceed the letter of the law—something more than the ordinary* human virtue—such perfection as they imagined Christ alluded to in the evangelical counsels (*consilia evangelica*). Furthermore, Christ created, and made known to those who believed on him, a state of perfect blessedness, respecting which they would have known nothing by the light of natural reason, and to which it is impossible to attain, except by the new means of grace which Christ has bestowed. In addition to these positive works of Christ, he also secured for the great mass of mankind, very few indeed being excepted, the forgiveness of their sins. By all these provisions, Christ supplied many new motives to moral effort, bestowed on men a new power, to gain the victory over the impulses of sense and the allurements of sin. These new motives are, for example, the hope of eternal blessedness on condition of obeying Christ's commands; the example of Christ stimulating to imitation; gratitude for the obtained forgiveness of sin; and, above all, gratitude for the great work of the Son of God in becoming man and giving his life for men. It would be wronging the Pelagians to affirm that they proposed fear of punishment and hope of heavenly rewards as the only motives to goodness; as it might be supposed they did from some of their assertions. Julian expressly mentions the return of love, enkindled by the revelation of the love of God, and gratitude, as incentives to new moral efforts; he describes a stage of Christian attainment proceeding from such motives, at which Christians do good from pure love to God and for goodness' sake,—not for the sake of any outward reward,—where they feel themselves happy in the practice of good works even under sufferings. "The fulness of the divine love, which gave things their existence," says Julian, "revealed itself in this, that the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us. When God re-

* Similar to that distinction of the ancients between *ἀρετὴ θεία* and *πολιτική*, which indeed will not harmonize at all with the essential character of Christianity, since it is at variance with the principle of *divine humanity*

quired an answering love on the part of those created in his own image, he showed how he had done everything out of his ineffable love towards us, that so we might finally love him in return, who evinced his love to us, in that he spared not his own Son, but gave him up for us; promising us that, if from henceforth we would obey his will, he would make us joint heirs with his only begotten Son.* This love to God kindled in our hearts is of such effect—as Julian, who was himself conscious of a willingness to suffer for the cause of Christ, rightly explaining and applying the passage in Rom. v. 3, remarks†—that we not only rejoice in the hope of future blessings, but, in the possession of virtue, are cheerful amidst sufferings; that we consider the wrath of our persecutors rather as trial of our patience than a disturbance of our joy; that we not only refrain from sin for the sake of reward, but even count freedom from sin as a reward in itself.”

It is clear from what has been said, that, so far as justification is understood in its objective and judicial sense, the Pelagians certainly acknowledged this,‡ as also the sanctifying influence which faith in the forgiveness of sin obtained by Christ must, through the awakening of trust and love towards God, exercise on the heart of man, and so on the whole direction of his life.§

But although the Pelagians set forth clearly and distinctly the outward connection between Christ and believers, founded on what he had once done and obtained for mankind and secured to them for the future, still the inner connection between the two was placed by them, as it could not fail to be according to the fundamental principles of their theory, far in the background. Augustin ever urges it as an objection to their scheme, that they made the grace of Christ consist solely in the bestowment of forgiveness; that they left man, after he had obtained this, to his own free-will, and did not acknow-

* Opus imperfect. I. 94.

† L. c. l. II. 166.

‡ As Julian declares, opus imperfect. II. 165, *justificatio per peccatorum veniam*.

§ Julian (opus imperfect. II. 227), rightly explaining the sense of the apostle Paul, says: *Eo debetis servire Deo fidelius quo liberalius. Peccatum quippe dominabatur vobis, cum reatum impendebat ultio; postea autem quam gratia Dei beneficia consecuti estis et depositis reatum ponderibus respirastis, ingenuo pudore commoniti debetis gratiam referre medicanti.*

ledge, that even now his entire inner righteousness or sanctification is only the work of Christ,—that the new principle of divine life which is the spring of all goodness in believers flows from the union with him by faith. The inner connection between Christ and believers, the thence resulting justification or sanctification of man having its foundation in Christ,* this it was which Augustin distinctly held forth in opposition to the Pelagians. Only justification in that Augustinian sense was the subject of discussion in this controversy, and thus this controversy became one and the same with that concerning grace.†

Augustin represents the process of development of the moral and religious life to be as follows: He distinguishes, according to Paul, the letter of the law, which killeth, and the spirit, which maketh alive.‡ By mere knowledge of the law as an imperative letter, disciplinary grace, from which even the first motions towards goodness proceed, leads man to the knowledge of his sins, to a consciousness that by his own power he cannot fulfil the law; hence springs the feeling of the need of a Redeemer, and so, faith in him. By faith, man not only obtains forgiveness of sin, but also enters into the fellowship of the divine life with the Redeemer; he attains to the grace whereby his soul is healed from the malady of sin. With the health of the soul is restored back also the free-will—as contradistinguished from that which till now was bound in the service of sin. The will is once more the servant of righteousness with free love. The divine life, which takes a specific form in man, reveals itself in works of love. This is the spirit of the law, which makes alive; the love shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost.

From this flowed another difference between the two ways of thinking. As Pelagius generally sided, for the most part, with the system of the Oriental church, and as the Greek church-teachers, owing to their more enlarged historical views, were more particular in distinguishing the different stages and periods in the divine education of man, and in the development

* This is what Augustin understands by the term *justificatio*, a word which he does not take in the same sense with the Pelagians.

† Augustin. *de gratia Christi*, s. 52. *Eam esse gratiam Dei per Jesum Christum, in qua nos sua, non nostra justitia justos facit.*

‡ As for example, in the noble work *de spiritu et litera*.

of revelation, so he separated, according to the above-explained presupposition of a progressive deterioration of human nature and of a progressive counteraction against it, the three periods: 1. Of righteousness in the state of nature. 2. Of righteousness under the law; and 3. Of righteousness under grace. Augustin, on the contrary, could only admit that one and the same need of redemption, and one and the same source of holiness, ever existed; namely, *grace*, which is obtained through faith; if not faith in the Saviour already manifested, yet faith in him as promised. "Even under the law, there were those who stood, not under the terrifying, convicting, punishing law, but under that grace which fills the heart with joy in what is good, which heals it, and makes it free."*

Augustin was thus led to give prominence to the principle on which the essential character and unity of everything Christian reposes, namely, the divine life that springs from the consciousness of redemption; and to mark with more precision the specific peculiarity whereby the Christian life, Christian virtue, is distinguished from all other. In the Pelagian system, on the contrary, there was nothing which enabled one rightly to understand either the essential nature of regeneration as the separating line betwixt two opposite positions of the moral life, or the nature of the new Christian life grounded therein. While Augustin thus pointed out the common centre of the religious and moral element in Christianity, and took his stand in opposition to the separating of the doctrinal from the ethical element, in opposition to the isolating and to the making outward of the ethical, the Pelagians fell into the very error which was necessarily involved in the principles of their scheme. From what has been said, the great merit of Augustin is clearly apparent in bringing forward a system of ethics reduced to a central point, belonging in common to it and to the Christian scheme of faith. Augustin, in this respect, as also in others hereafter to be mentioned, had, by his systematic method of apprehending Christianity, a more important influence on the history of the development of the system of ethics in this period, than Ambrose of Milan, who is not to be compared to him for systematizing skill and intellectual depth;

* De peccato originis, s. 29. Non sub lege terrente, convincente, puniente; sed sub gratia delectante, sanante, liberante.

though he acquired great celebrity in the history of this science by his work *De officiis*, in three books.*

But there was something of error attached to those truths, which Augustin placed at the head of all others. In precisely pointing out the peculiar principle of the Christian life, and marking the opposition between that which is Christian and that which is not Christian, since his eye was fixed exclusively on the extreme points of this opposition, he paid less attention to the manifold intermediate shades and points of transition in practical life, the various combinations of the factors by which the conduct may verge even to the non-Christian position. And hence he was the means of bringing into vogue an unduly rigid and partial method of judging the point of ethical development before the appearance of Christianity. He very justly distinguishes the patriotism of the ancients from that which is to be called "virtue," in the genuinely Christian sense, and which depends on the disposition towards God (*virtus* from *virtus vera*); but then he goes so far as to overlook altogether what bears some relationship to the divine life in such occasional coruscations of the moral element of human nature, and to see in them nothing but a service done for evil spirits or for man's glory. He contributed greatly, on this particular side, to promote in the Western church the partial and contracted way of judging the ancient pagan times, as opposed to the more liberal Alexandrian views, of which we still find traces in many of the Orientals in this period, and to which Augustin himself, in the earlier part of his life, as a Platonist, had been inclined. Still the vestiges of his earlier and loftier mode of thinking are to be discerned in his later writings, where he searches after and recognizes the scattered fragments of truth and goodness in the pagan literature (see below) which he uniformly traces to the revelation of the Spirit, who is the original source of all that is true and good to created minds; though this is inconsistent with *his own*

* This work is rather a collection of practical rules for the clergy, (hence its original title, *De officiis ministrorum*.) drawn from certain general maxims, than a systematic development of Christian ethics. But the work is entitled to the merit of having been the first to apply the formal principles of ethics, as treated by the ancient writers, to the Christian system of morals, in that peculiar modification of them which they receive.

theory respecting the total corruption of human nature, and with the *particularism* of his doctrine of predestination.

The Pelagians appealed particularly to the splendid examples of virtue among the pagans, as proving what could be done by the moral power of human nature left to itself, in opposition to the tenet of man's moral corruption. Augustin maintained, on the contrary, that as there is no neutral ground between good and evil; as love to God is the spring of all that is truly good, and self-love the principle of sin; as that victorious principle of goodness which overcomes the opposing selfishness of man's nature can proceed only from faith; so everything which has not its root in faith is, of course, sin; and he refers for proof to a passage of scripture, which before his own time had been misapprehended in the same way, and which afterwards very generally received this false application—the declaration of the apostle Paul in Rom. xiv. 23, “Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin” (*omne quod non ex fide, peccatum*).^{*} From this Augustin argued, that the so-called virtues of the pagans were but seeming virtues. This proposition appeared so absurd to Julian, who overlooked the principle of morality, its internal unity and religious foundation,[†] that he could not sufficiently express his surprise at it, and drew from it the strangest conclusions. “If,” said he, “the chastity of the pagans were no chastity, then it might be said, with the same propriety, that the bodies of unbelievers are no bodies; that the eyes of the pagans could not see; that the grain which grew in the fields of pagans was no grain.”[‡] Augustin replied, that moral goodness could not be contemplated in this isolated way; but that, in the estimation of moral worth, the question turned on the whole unity of the inner life, from which men's actions

^{*} The Pelagian Julian seems to have rightly perceived, from the connection of the words in this passage, that it referred to an entirely different matter, and simply respected actions done contrary to one's own conviction of duty. See Augustin, c. Julian. IV. 24.

[†] In other respects, Julian was well aware that the morality or immorality of actions must be judged, not by the outward act, but by the direction of the will. *Hoc operatur foris jam ipsa justitia, quam intus voluntas sancta concepit et peperit. Opus imperfect. l. 79.* But it might be true, at the same time, that, while he regarded the virtues as being inner tendencies and properties of the soul, he might still not be aware of their higher internal unity, nor perceive their inmost root in the one essence, which is the moral disposition. [‡] L. c. 27.

proceed. He referred to Matth. vi. 23, and said, The eye of the soul is the whole bent of the inner man.* He who seems to do a good action, but in doing it does not propose to himself the end which true wisdom prescribes for all human activity, sins by having the tendency of his inward being estranged from that which constitutes man's highest good.† If all actions are not judged according to this principle of temper and disposition, then what really proceeds from a sinful disposition may appear to be a virtue, and sins may seem to be conquered by sins; but virtue can never be realized in this way.

Julian betrays his own want of a profound understanding of the principles of ethics, when he adduces this remark of Augustin in evidence against him, and observes that if sin is overcome by means of sin, how much more may sin be overcome by virtue, and how much more must it be possible to lead a sinless life.‡ He took no account here, then, of the difference betwixt a *true victory* over sin, and a mere outward check placed against certain outbreaks of the evil, or the exchanging of one kind of sin for another kind, while the sinful bent of the will continued to be the same. All true virtue, according to Augustin's doctrine, proceeds from Christian love, which refers everything to God; nothing but the acts of this love is truly moral, and all the cardinal virtues must therefore be reduced to love, and have this for their animating principle.§ In whatever exhibits itself as virtue without this ethical principle, Augustin recognizes, indeed, various natural gifts and qualities proceeding from the Creator, and also to be ascribed to his grace, but nothing which answers to the Christian idea of virtue.||

* Oculus intentio, qua facit quisque, quod facit, l. c. 28.

† Quidquid boni fit ab homine, et non propter hoc fit, propter quod fieri debere vera sapientia præcepit, etsi officio (opificium, the outward action) videatur bonum, ipso non recto fine peccatum est, l. c. 21.

‡ Compare what Schleiermacher says (p. 21) on the conception of virtue, in opposition to such a superficial view of the matter.

§ Quæ per cæteras virtutes omnes diffunditur dilectio Dei et proximi. De diversis questionibus octoginta tribus. Qu. 61, s. 4.

|| D. na Dei, sub cujus occultissimo judicio, nec injusto, alii fatui, alii tardissimi ingenii nascuntur, alii natura lenes, alii levissimis causis ira facillima ardent, alii vindictæ cupiditatem inter utroque mediocres. C. Julian, l. IV. s. 16.

But then, although Julian recognized no intrinsic difference between actions called virtuous from different points of view, yet at the same time, not departing here from the doctrine of the church—since he found eternal happiness, the happiness of the kingdom of heaven, promised in the New Testament only to believers—he fell into the inconsistency of making an outward distinction between two kinds of virtue and of good works grounded on the results flowing from them: one kind, the Christian, on account of the reward connected with them, were good in a *fruitful*—the other, from a want of these rewards, were good in an *unfruitful* way.* And at the ground of this view lay, in fact, the notion that religion stood in a mere external relation to morality, and that the future reward or happiness was related in an outward and arbitrary manner to man's life and conduct. Augustin very justly exposed this inconsistency, and observed that whatever is truly good can never be unfruitful, that the result must necessarily correspond to the intrinsic character and quality of human actions.

Yet the Pelagians might have been able, on their own principles, to make out a distinction between the ethical standing ground in Christianity and that in paganism, if the systematic apprehension of the ethical element in its connection with the religious had not lain too remote from their ordinary habits of thinking; for, as they derived the existence of peculiar motives and a peculiar direction of moral conduct from the nature of Christian faith, they needed only to carry out and apply this principle still farther, in order to find such a difference; and indeed Pelagius himself remarks, that love, which does everything for the glory of God, is a thing to which the ancient world was a stranger.†

Conformably with the manifold stages through which, according to the system of Augustin, disciplinary grace conducts the evolution of the divine life in human nature, that grace must receive many specific designations. In so far as grace, preceding all merit in man, first attracts the corrupt will

* Fructuose and steriliter bona.

† Sufferunt et philosophi, sed non in caritate. Nos vero non ut laudari, sed ut ille quem sustinemus proficiat [to the honour of him whom we bear] (perhaps bear within us, represent) diligentes sustinere debemus, (for assuredly we have no reason for supposing these words to be an addition of Cassiodor's.) On Ephes. iv. 2.

of him who is like all others in a state of alienation from God, and with an inner irresistible necessity produces in him the first motions to goodness, awakens him to a feeling of the need of redemption and to faith, it is called *prævenient, præparing* grace (*gratia præveniens, præparans*). It now proceeds to create in him, by faith, a free-will to that which is good (*gratia operans*); but this is not a change whereby man lays aside at once his entire nature, and is raised above all conflict with sin. There still ever continue to remain in him two principles in conflict with each other: in so far as he is born of God, lives in fellowship with Christ, he sins no more; but in so far as he bears within him the old nature, derived from the first fallen man, sin still continues cleaving to him.* Hence he ever continues to need the grace which upholds the restored free-will, co-operating grace (*gratia co-operans*), to bring forth that which is good, and to be carried victoriously through the struggle with sin.† Although Augustin referred the explanation of the fact why it was that grace, although it had the power, yet brought no one in this present life to a state of perfect sinlessness, to God's incomprehensible counsels, still he offered the following as a reason which appeared to him not improbable. So long as man has not attained, as he will do in the life eternal, to an intuition of the supreme good, so that in comparison with it he counts himself as altogether nothing; so long as he is not so filled with its spirit, that not barely from rational conviction, but also with eternal love, he prefers it to his own self;‡ so long as this condition is left unfulfilled, man is ever exposed to the danger of pride, which may so much the more easily fasten on the self-contemplation of the rational spirit, because this is, in fact, far loftier than all else in the earthly creation. For this reason, man must guard against this by constantly struggling with himself. To this Julian might object, that Augustin reasoned in a circle,

* See *e. g.* de perfectione justitiæ hominis, s. 39.

† Co-operando perficit, quod operando incipit. Ipse ut velimus operatur incipiens, qui volentibus co-operatur perficiens. De gratia et libero arbitrio, s. 33.

‡ Quamdiu non videt sicut videbit in fine summum illud et immutabile bonum, in cujus comparatione se spernat, sibi que illius caritate vilescat, tantoque spiritu ejus impleatur, ut id sibi non ratione sola, sed æterno quoque amore præponat. C. Julian. IV. 28.

when, he said man must still continue in sin in order to be preserved against sin, viz., the sin of pride.* But Augustin, in reply, appealed to experience—to the fact that the apostle needed to have the thorn left in his flesh as an admonition to humility.† He uses an illustration drawn from the healing art: “As if the ulcer were not painful, and the operation of the knife painful also, so that one pain is cured by another. Had we not learned this by experience, but only heard of it in some country where operations of this sort were unknown, we should doubtless ridicule the idea, and perhaps say in his own words, It is most absurd that pain should be necessary to stop an ulcer from being painful.”†

As man, then, continues ever to be exposed in this present life, by reason of this unceasing conflict, to the danger of falling again, he accordingly needs, in order to attain salvation, the grace which can enable him victoriously to persevere to the end of the conflict; and, in reference to this, Augustin denominates grace by the title of *donum perseverantiæ*. This perseverance alone is the certain mark of the elect.

This doctrine concerning grace, with all its determinate forms as here unfolded, stood necessarily connected with the doctrine of absolute predestination. And if this doctrine was so taught and preached, it was liable to the imputations which the Pelagians repeatedly brought against it: that Augustin introduced, under the name of grace, a certain fatalism (*fatum*); that he absolutely denied the free-will belonging to the essence of man's nature; that he annulled all the conditions of a righteous judgment of God. In respect to free-will, Augustin ever maintained that as the law is not annulled by faith, but only fulfilled by it, so free-will is not destroyed by grace, but the will is only made truly free; and he appealed to the declaration of Christ, that he only whom the Son makes free is free indeed. But here, misled by the ambiguity of the expression,

* Absurdissimum quippe et stultissimum putat, peccatum fuisse, ne peccatum esset, quoniam et ipsa superbia utique peccatum est. L. c. s. 30.

† Quasi non et ulcus in dolore est, et sectio dolorem operatur, ut dolor dolore tollatur. Hoc si experti non essemus et in aliquibus terris, ubi ista nunquam contingerant, audiremus, sine dubio utique deridentes, fortassis etiam verbis hujus uteremur et diceremus: absurdissimum est, dolorem necessarium fuisse, ne ulceris dolor esset, L. c.

he confounded together two different conceptions*—the conception of freedom as a certain state and stage of moral development, and of freedom as a certain faculty possessed in common by all rational minds. Beyond question Augustin gave a more profound view of freedom in that former sense (this being connected with his idea of grace as a principle of divine life) than was to be found in the Pelagian system. But it was not so with freedom in the latter sense, which was properly the point in question in this particular controversy. This Augustin certainly denied to all the descendants of fallen man; for, in fact, he did not allow to all men the ability of attaining to that higher moral freedom. He considered this ability as being not an inalienable possession of the rational spirit, but a gift communicated, only by a special divine operation, to a certain number of men. In respect to those who belong to this latter class, it is improper to speak of a *free self-determination* in appropriating what is bestowed on them by grace, since their wills are renewed by inner necessity, through the almighty will of God. And as these latter follow an irresistible influence from above, so the great mass of mankind, the servants of sin, follow an irresistible influence of a lower kind. But at the same time Augustin maintained, that by the operation of grace the power of free self-determination was not destroyed, contenting himself here with the idea of a freedom in appearance; of a seeming freedom necessarily forming itself in the consciousness of the creature; inasmuch, namely, as the operations of grace unfolded themselves after the form of the human nature, of the rational human consciousness, in the form of self-determination outwardly and phenomenally presented. Hence man, though determined by a higher principle, transforming his will with irresistible power, which he follows in harmony with the law of his nature, is yet not conscious of his will having been subjected to constraint. In this sense he said, therefore, that the operation of grace presupposed the free-will belonging to the essence of reason; that, if man were not created in the image of God, he could not be susceptible of grace. Grace can act on man, not on stones.†

* A thing which the Pelagians, too, did not fail to censure. C. Julian. opus imperfect. I. 176.

† Neque enim gratia Dei lapidibus aut lignis pecoribusve præstatur, sed quia imago Dei est meretur hanc gratiam. C. Julian. IV. 15. Non

It was an inconsistency in the Augustinian system that, while he unquestionably derived the first sin from man's free self-determination, he made everything else depend on an unconditional, divine predetermination. He would have been logically consistent if, following the principle which had led him to this whole theory, he had derived the conduct of Adam, like all other, from this unconditional predetermination. This inconsistency was clearly exposed by Julian.* But still this was a noble inconsistency, which grew out of the victory of his religious, moral feeling, over the logical and speculative tendency of his intellect. In this way he could still hold fast, at one point, to the holiness and justice of God, and to the free guilt of man; could remove the origin of evil from God, and push it back to the originally present, truly free self-determining power of man. And by his supposition of the necessary and incomprehensible connection between the first man and the entire race, this inconsistency is still obviated in his own mind; for as the act of the first man may be considered as the proper act of every man, so on this ground the loss of the original freedom is a loss for which all are at fault.

This Augustinian system, which was constructed with so much dialectical art, could be so handled, when set forth with the prudence, wisdom, and dialectic skill of an Augustin, as to avoid the practically mischievous consequences which might flow from it in its application to life. Those who, like Augustin, had come into this system through the whole evolution of their inner life; those in whom it had become wholly fused with the fundamental experiences of their Christian consciousness; those who had already attained to a certain inward peace and stability of Christian life; might doubtless find in this system satisfaction and repose. The life in faith which they possessed—the consciousness of a divine life—raised them above the doubts which might arise from the reflection whether or no they belonged to the number of the elect. But the case was

sicut in lapidibus insensatis, aut sicut in iis, in quorum natura rationem voluntatemque non condidit, salutem nostram Deus operatur in nobis. De peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. II. s. 6.

* Opus imperf. VI. 22. Unde tu nosti, illuti tantummoda justum fuisse, ut in Adam nisi voluntarium crimen non possit ulcisci, si injustum esse non nosti, imputari quiquam in crimen, quod fatearis sine voluntate susceptum?

different where this system was taught in a less prudent and skilful manner, or where it came to such as were still involved in many inward conflicts, and were liable to be disturbed by reflection on their own state. Augustin could not fail to meet many such cases in his own experience, and it is remarkable to observe the way in which he disposed of them. From such cases he took occasion to unfold his system still farther with reference to its practical application.

One of Augustin's doctrinal and polemical dissertations, which referred to these disputes, his letter to the presbyter Sixtus, afterwards bishop of Rome,* having been circulated among the monks of a cloister at Adrumetum, in the North-African province of Byzace, produced great excitement and agitation in the minds of many of these recluses. This happened between the years 426 and 427. There came forward individuals among them who derived practically mischievous conclusions from Augustin's doctrines concerning grace and predetermination. Of what use, said they, are all doctrines and precepts? Human efforts can avail nothing; it is God that worketh in us to will and to do. Nor is it right to reproach or to punish those who are in error, and who commit sin, for it is none of their fault that they act thus. Without grace they cannot do otherwise; nor can they do anything to merit grace. All we should do, then, is to pray for them. Augustin, having been informed of these disturbances by delegates from the cloister, and by a letter from the Abbot Valentine, addressed to the monks two books—one in which he more fully unfolded his doctrine concerning the relation of grace to free-will, in opposition to Pelagianism (*de gratia et libero arbitrio*); a second, in which he more distinctly explained that doctrine on the side of its practical bearings, and with reference to those consequences which had been drawn from it (the work *de correptione et gratia*). According to Augustin's doctrine, unconditioned predetermination is not an arbitrary act of God, whereby he bestows everlasting happiness on men while loaded with all manner of sins; but a necessary intermediate link in the communication of grace. This is the source of divine life in those that possess it; and it must reveal itself by an inward impulse, in the bringing forth of good fruits. But then, even here, too, no limits can be fixed where

* Ep. 194, among the letters of Augustin.

the divine agency commences and ceases, and where the human begins and ends ; both proceed inseparably together. The human will, taken possession of by divine grace, works that which is good with freedom, as a transformed and sanctified will ; and grace can only work through the will, which serves as its organ. Hence Augustin says, "He who is a child of God must feel himself impelled by the spirit of God to do right ; and, having done it, he thanks God, who gave him the power and the pleasure of so doing. But he who does not what is right, or does it not from the right temper of love, let him pray God that he may have the grace which he has not yet obtained." By reason of the inner connection which Augustin supposed between the first sin and the sin of all mankind, as it has been above explained, he maintained that the individual cannot excuse himself on the ground of the general depravity, and that his sins are none the less to be imputed to him as his own fault. Furthermore, God, by his grace is, beyond question, able to operate on the hearts of men, not only without our exhorting, correcting, or reproving them, but even without our interceding for them. Beyond question, all these second causes could produce the designed effect on men only under the presupposition of divine grace, which operates through human instrumentality, and without which all human instrumentality would avail nothing, and under the presupposition that the men, whom we would lead to salvation, belong to the number of the elect. But as God, however, often conveys his grace to men by means of such instrumentality ; as no certain marks are given us in the present life whereby it is possible to distinguish the elect from the non-elect ; as we are bound, in the spirit of charity, to wish that all may attain to salvation ; so, assuming in the spirit of charity, that God will use us as his instruments to convert and bring to salvation these or those individuals who at present are living in sin, we are bound to employ all those means that are in our power, leaving the result with God.

The way in which Augustin sought, in these writings, to secure his system against misrepresentation, could not be suited to set those minds at rest whose Christian feelings had been disturbed by what he had said respecting the relation of divine grace and predestination to the free-will ; but such persons must rather have found in this a still further confirmation of

their doubts. . And as his system of faith, on this side, agreed in nowise with the prevailing doctrinal way of thinking in the Western church ; as, in the Pelagian and Augustinian systems, directly opposite tendencies, which on different sides were at variance with the demands of the universal Christian consciousness, stood in conflict with each other ; it was natural that an intermediate and conciliatory tendency between these two opposites should make its appearance. This tendency proceeded more particularly from the cloisters of Southern France, Provence, and the adjacent islands, as its representative and most influential organ appears, in the first place, an individual who holds a very important place in the history of Western monachism, and who enjoyed a high reputation in these districts—*John Cassian*. He probably came from the country bordering on the Black Sea (being one of the so-called Scythian monks), and, after many travels in the East, had at length turned his steps to Marseilles, where he became the founder and abbot of a famous cloister. Without doubt, his early and long residence in the Eastern church had had a decided influence on his doctrinal bent ; and perhaps in his predominant practical tendency, in his disinclination to doctrinal speculations, which attempted to define too nicely on the questions here brought into controversy, his tendency to give prominence on these questions to the religious, *moral* interest, and to refer everything more particularly to the *love of God* ; perhaps in all these traits we may discern the spirit of the great Chrysostom, with whom he long lived in the capacity of deacon, and whose disciple he delighted to call himself.* Cassian sought to grasp the doctrines of religion with the heart rather than with speculative and systematizing thought. He counselled the monks, instead of studying a multitude of commentaries on the sacred scriptures, to aim rather at obtaining purity of heart. Nothing but the darkening of the understanding by sin caused what the Holy Spirit revealed to appear so obscure to men ; and it was because men sought not to come to the knowledge of divine things with a purified sense, that so many false doctrines had been foisted upon the holy scriptures.† Especially in relation to the treatment of

* See Cassian. lib. VII. de incarnatione, c. 31.

† Monachum ad scripturarum notitiam pertingere cupientem, nequam debere labores suos erga commentatorum libros impendere ; sed

the doctrine of grace, he required that, preserving in simplicity of heart the simple faith of the fishermen, men should not receive it in a worldly spirit, with logical syllogisms and Ciceronian eloquence, but should know that it could only be understood by the experience of a pure life.* We might almost suppose that this passage, in the mind of Cassian, contained a reproof of the (in his opinion) too logical tendency of Augustin: it cannot be proved, however, that he meant any such direct personal allusion.†

Cassian departed altogether from the Pelagian system by recognizing the universal corruption of human nature as a consequence of the first transgression, and by recognizing "grace" as well as "justification" in the sense of Augustin. But the whole takes with him a different turn, by its connection with the idea of a divine love, which extends to all men, which wills the salvation of all, and refers everything to this; even subordinating the punishment of the wicked to this simple end. The conflict of the flesh and the spirit is, indeed, a consequence of that original schism; but this conflict is now made to subserve a salutary purpose in the moral education of man, that so the soul, amid its many struggles and efforts, necessitated to strive after moral purity, may thereby be awakened to self-consciousness, and preserved from pride and inactivity.‡ It is, perhaps, with allusion to the Pelagian positions, he says, in one passage of his institutions and rules of monastic life:§ "We have to thank God, not only for having endowed us with reason and free-will, and bestowed on us the knowledge of his law or the grace of baptism, but also for the gifts of his daily providence; that he delivers us from the snares of invisible enemies; that he coöperates with us in enabling us to overcome the sins of the flesh; that he protects us, even when we are unconscious of it, from dangers;

potius omnem mentis industriam et intentionem cordis erga emundationem vitiorum carnalium detinere. Institution. cœnobial. l. V. c. 33.

* L. c. l. XII. c. 19.

† In his work against Nestorius, which he wrote at the commencement of the Nestorian disputes (*de incarnatione Domini*, l. VII. c. 27), he calls Augustin "magnus sacerdos;"—but this epithet must have been given to Augustin after he became distinguished in the Western church: yet it says little, compared with those epithets which he bestows on Hilary, Ambrose, and Jerome.

‡ Collat. c. 7. etc.

§ Institutiones cœnobial. c. 18.

that he keeps us from falling into sins; that he sustains and enlightens us; that he teaches us to understand the law which he has given to help us;* that, by his secret influences, we are punished on account of our sins; that we are sometimes drawn to salvation even against our wills; that finally he draws our free-will itself, prone by its own inclination to what is vicious and wrong, into the path of virtue." Even in these remarks we discern the whole peculiarity of Cassian's form of doctrine on this matter. Isolated Christian experiences lie at the foundation of all which he thus collects together; and moreover all the marks and characters of Augustin's system are to be found here, excepting alone the constraining influence of grace on the free-will. But Cassian brings together isolated facts without logical order, and in a manner quite remote from the systematic development of conceptions, such as we find in Augustin.

In faith, too, he recognizes the communication of divine grace.† He constantly affirms the insufficiency of free-will for that which is good without grace; that, without this, all human efforts avail nothing, all willing and running of man is to no purpose; that it is vain to speak of any proper merit or desert on the part of man, although the operation of grace is ever conditioned on the free self-determination of the human will; that, in many cases, there is moreover such a thing as prevenient grace.‡ He especially laboured, in his monastic colloquies, the famous thirteen among his Collations, to unfold and explain what lay scattered in the above-cited passages. Here also he speaks in the same decided and emphatic manner against the two extremes, as well the Augustinian denial of free-will, as the Pelagian infringement of grace. In both these opposite tendencies he sees human presumption, which would explore and define what is unsearchable to human reason. He

* Cassian says here, *adjutorium nostrum, quod non aliud quidam interpretari volunt, quam legem*;—which words are manifestly aimed against the Pelagians. Tillemont wrongly supposes that he has discovered here something bordering on the Pelagian mode of expression, which Cassian could not have allowed himself to fall into, after the above-named decisions of the Roman bishops against the Pelagians; but this mode of expression is in its essential meaning, so anti-Pelagian, that Augustin himself might have approved of it. Cassian, in fact, says here that it was only by the inward enlightening influence of grace, the law itself could be of any help to man.

† Collat. III. c. 16.

‡ Collat. IV. c. 4, etc. and other places

says here, free-will and grace are so blended and fused with each other, that for this very reason the question has been much discussed by many, whether free-will depends on grace, or grace on free-will; and in answering this question in a presumptuous manner, men have fallen into opposite errors. He affirms that this question does not admit of a general answer suitable for all cases. He controverts as well those who wholly denied a prevenient grace, and made grace always dependent on man's desert, as those who denied to the human will any ability to create the germ of goodness by its own efforts, and who supposed grace to be always prevenient. This question, he thought, could not be settled by general conceptions, formed a priori, respecting the *modus operandi* of grace; but could be answered only according to the various facts of experience, as they are brought to view in the holy scriptures; though here, from want of more profound reflection, he neglected to consider that this inquiry transcends the limits of experience and of the phenomenal world, the question relating to invisible motives and laws. Would any one assert that the beginning of the good will always proceeds from man, the examples of Matthew the publican and of Paul are against him. Would any one say, on the contrary, that the beginning of the good will is always communicated by divine grace, he must be embarrassed by the examples of Zaccheus, and of the thief on the cross, whose craving spirits, taking the kingdom of God by violence, anticipated the special call of divine grace. Against those who asserted the last, he endeavoured to show that human nature had, by the fall, in nowise lost all its ability for goodness. Men should take heed how they refer all the merits of the saints to God in such a sense as to assign nothing but what is bad to human nature. Through the benevolence of the Creator, the seeds of all virtue were by nature implanted in the soul; but, unless excited by the help of God, they would never germinate and grow up to maturity. Where grace, then, permitted human striving, feeble as it was, to have the precedence,* still it should be considered that what grace bestows on man is far beyond all human desert:† there is no comparison between the two. He calls it profane to say,

* Ne penitus dormienti aut inertī otio dissoluto sua dona conferre videatur.

† Gratia Dei semper gratuita.

that grace is imparted only accordingⁿ to human desert. While Augustin employed the declaration of the apostle Paul in Rom. xi. concerning the unsearchableness of the divine judgments, to prove the doctrine of the secret, unconditioned counsels of predestination; Cassian, on the other hand, referred it to the manifold modes of the operation of divine love, controlling, directing, and bestowing its gifts in wisdom; and this he set over against the dogmatic narrowness of heart, the presumptuous littleness of mind, which would fix and determine everything according to one idea. He who trusted he was able by his own reason perfectly to fathom or to express the ways which God takes for man's salvation, contradicted those words of the apostle, that God's judgments and ways are unsearchable to men. The God of the universe so works all in all, as that he excites the free-will, upholds and strengthens it, not so that he again withdraws from man the free-will which he himself bestowed. If man's reason, and the induction of evidence, seem to have made out anything which militates against these propositions, all this should much rather be shunned, than countenanced to the destruction of faith.

Cassian's opposition to the system of Augustin found great acceptance among the monks and even the bishops of these districts.* Doubtless, too, many of the monks had, of their own free impulse, without any influencing cause from without, become opposed to the Augustinian doctrine of election; individuals who subsequently attached themselves to Cassian, as the most important man among them, on account of his theological training; for it may be gathered, from what Prosper reports about them to Augustin, that all did not perfectly agree with Cassian in their views respecting the disputed points, though they agreed in opposing the doctrine of absolute predestination.

When Augustin's work *de correptione et gratia* arrived in Gaul, these opponents of Augustin's doctrine of predestination—whom for brevity's sake we will denominate Semi-Pelagians,† a name which came into use at a much later period—

* See Prosper's letter to Augustin.

† The Semi-Pelagians themselves were far from applying to their sect any such name as this, as they wished to have nothing in common with the Pelagians; but their opponents, too, were very far from wishing to designate them by this name, the opponents of Pelagianism not admitting that there was any middle ground. They looked upon Semi-Pelagianism as nothing but a mere off-shoot of Pelagianism.

perceived from it that those practically mischievous consequences which had ever appeared to them the dubious thing in this doctrine, had actually been derived from them by those African monks; but they were not at all satisfied with the manner in which Augustin got rid of these consequences; and hence they were only the more fully confirmed in their own persuasions. Besides this Semi-Pelagian party, there was, however, in this part of Gaul, a small party also of enthusiastic admirers of Augustin, and devoted adherents to his whole system of doctrine, to whom, though they perhaps recognized the difference between Semi-Pelagianism and Pelagianism, yet every doctrine which represented the operations of divine grace in man as conditioned on man's recipiency, appeared to be a denial of grace proceeding from impious pride. At the head of this party stood, at that time, an ecclesiastic by the name of Prosper, who, induced perhaps by the desolations of war, had left his native country, Aquitania, and settled down in these parts. Amid the great and fearful revolutions of this century, particularly in his own country, by which within a short space of time the lot of whole nations as well as individuals was reversed, he found consolation and repose in entire submission to God's inscrutable decrees, in renouncing all earthly hopes, and relying on God's all-controlling grace; and the great facts of that particular age in the history of nations furnished him with abundant evidence in confirmation of the doctrine of absolute predestination.* This Prosper, and his

* Prosper, and also the author of the work *de vocatione gentium*, refer to these facts, especially as showing how different tribes of people were led to embrace the faith of the gospel. In the beautiful poem of "A husband to his wife," in which the writer refers to the state of those times as an argument and motive for renouncing earthly things, and which in some manuscripts is ascribed to Prosper, are to be found the feelings and ideas at least which characterized his own religious tone of mind. He says of his times:

Non idem status est agris, non urbibus ullis:
Omniaque in finem præcipitata ruunt.
Impia confuso sævit discordia mundo,
Pax abest terris; ultima quæque vides.

And after having expressed his resolution to devote himself entirely to Christ, he adds:

Nec tamen ista mihi de me fiducia surgit.
Tu das, Christe, loqui, tuque pati tribuis.
In nobis nihil audemus; sed fidimus in te.
Spes igitur mea sola Deus, quem credere vita est.

friend Hilary, another warm admirer and zealous disciple of Augustin, gave him, each in a separate letter, an account of these movements among the monks, and begged that he would come to the rescue of the truth now assailed.

In reply to this request, Augustin wrote his two works, *De prædestinatione sanctorum*, and *De dono perseverantiæ*. He expresses his astonishment that those persons were not to be convinced by the many plain and express passages of sacred scripture respecting grace, which is always denied, when it is made to depend on human desert. Yet he is at the same time just enough to admit, that, by acknowledging original sin, the insufficiency of the faculty of free-will for all good, and prevenient grace, they differed essentially from Pelagianism, properly so called. And, considering the great importance which he attached to the other disputed points, we must respect the spirit of Christian moderation evinced by him when he added: "We must apply to them the words of Paul in Philip. iii. 15. If they walk according to the measure of their knowledge, and pray to him who giveth wisdom, he will reveal to them that also which they still want, in order to a correct insight into the doctrine of predestination."*

In these two tracts, he lays open his disputed scheme of doctrine, holding to it firmly in all its strictness, in the way we have already described; and we need here only notice what he says new in reference to the scruples professed by the Gallic Semi-Pelagians. These, as Prosper reported to Augustin, had affirmed that even if the doctrine of unconditional predestination were according to the truth, yet it ought not to be preached, because the doctrine could be of no use to any one, and might be mischievous to all. It tempts the pious to feel secure and to be inactive, and leads sinners to despair, instead of allowing them room for repentance. On the other hand, Augustin says: "We might keep silent as to those truths, the knowledge of which would only enrich the intellectual insight of those who were capable of understanding them, without exerting any influence on their moral improvement; but the misunderstanding of which would redound to the injury of those who were incapable of understanding them. But it is otherwise with those truths the right understanding of which

* *De prædestinatione sanctorum*, c. i.

is subservient to holiness, and the misunderstanding of which leads to all mischief. And among these latter truths is to be reckoned the doctrine of absolute predestination. It is only when misconstrued and falsely applied, it can become practically injurious. But the doctrine of divine foreknowledge is liable to the same misconstruction; as, for example, when it is so conceived as to lead men to make such statements as the following; "You may live as you please, yet that and that only will happen with you which God foresaw." In *preaching* the doctrine of predestination, all that is necessary is simply to keep it ever in mind that the preacher of the gospel is addressing either those who are already partakers of the redemption, or who are yet to become partakers of it, consequently the elect; so that the reprobate must be considered as those who are without the church, and be spoken of only in the third person. With great adroitness and skill, he showed how the doctrine of predestination should be used only for the purpose of exciting believers to an unshaken trust and confidence in God himself and in goodness, and at the same time to humility;—and how, on the other hand, everything should be avoided which, through misconstruction, might lead to false security or to despondency. The doctrine of predestination, if rightly presented, would, beyond question, contribute much to the furtherance of genuine Christian piety. "This doctrine," he concludes, "should be so set forth that he who properly receives and appropriates it will glory, not in that which is of man, hence not in that which is his own, but in the Lord; and even this, to glory only in the Lord, is, like all the rest, a gift of God, and indeed *the* gift of God, without which all other gifts are nothing." As Augustin's opponents could often cite against him, and that not without good grounds, the authority of the older divines; so, on the other hand, he himself appealed, not without reason, to the original and common expression of the unalterable Christian consciousness; as, for example, in the church prayers for the conversion of unbelievers, for the perseverance of believers to the end, in which prayers the assembled church were wont to join by saying, Amen. But at the same time, in interpreting these expressions of the Christian consciousness, as well as many passages from the older divines, he was led, by the influence of his own doctrinal system, to introduce more into them than they really

contained, when he would find in them testimony in favour of the doctrine of a grace which is conditioned on no sort of reciprocity on the part of man, and of a predestination connected with this notion of grace.

These writings made, and indeed were calculated to make, no other impression on the Semi-Pelagians than Augustin's earlier productions. Hence, Prosper—feeling himself constrained to stand forth in defence of the *conviction* of which his heart was so full, and of *the man* to whom he clung with an enthusiastic attachment,* as the triumphant defender of this fundamental truth against the adversaries of the doctrine of grace—wrote in opposition to those whom he designates as the *ungrateful*, his *carmen de ingratiss*. By this designation Prosper understands in general all those who considered the operations of grace as in any way conditioned by the free reciprocity of man; those who did not refer everything in man to grace alone. Although his attack was directed in this case more particularly against the Semi-Pelagians, yet, in looking at the subject from this particular point of view, Semi-Pelagianism would necessarily seem to coincide with Pelagianism; and, in truth, he endeavours to show that the doctrines of the Semi-Pelagians led ultimately to Pelagian principles.† He complains that his adversaries, who were for the most part rigid monks, mislaid many through the respect which they inspired by the virtues connected with their Christian renunciation of the world; but, as they looked upon these virtues as being part in their own work, they were but seeming virtues, destitute of the principle of all true goodness, that temper of the heart which refers everything to God alone, and which

* This very fact, that the firm persuasion of man's being nothing through himself, but everything through God alone, had pervaded Augustin's entire life, appears to Prosper the characteristic trait of this great man, the fundamental principle of his peculiar character. This is beautifully expressed by Prosper in his *carmen de ingratiss*, where he says of Augustin (v. 90):

Quem Christi gratia coram
 Uberiore rigans, nostro lumen dedit aëa.
 Accensum vero de lumine; nam cæcus illi
 Et vita et requies Deus est, omnisque voluptas
 Unus amor Christi est, unus Christi est honor illi.
 Et dum nulla sibi tribuit bona, sit Deus illi
 Omnia, et in sancto regnat sapientia templo.

† As Prosper says himself: *ingrati, quos urit ratio*, v. 685.

feels the sense of dependence on him for all things. A deep and sincerely Christian feeling of dependence breathes through this production, imparting to it warmth and vitality; but with all this, the author overlooks in his opponents the interest of a morality which would be free, and which assuredly has no less its foundation in Christianity than the sense of dependence. "Do they perhaps consider it a shame," says he of his opponents, "that Christ will one day be all in all in the redeemed? But if this is above all things else great and noble, why are they ashamed in this present vale of sorrow to be mighty through God, and to have in them as little as possible of their own, of that which is a mortal work, which is nothing but sin?"†

The contest between the Augustinian and the Semi-Pelagian party in Gaul still continued after the death of Augustin.‡

* Licet in cruce vitam
Ducant et jugi afficiant sua corpora morte,
Abstineant opibus, sint casti, sintque benigni,
Terræque fœdus annuunt superæstera relictæ;

still, surgendo cadunt, non horum templo est Christus petra fundamenta,
v. 775.

† Viles ergo putent se deformesque futuros
Cum transformatis fiet Deus unica sanctis
Gloria: corporei nec jam pressura laboris
Conteret incertos; sed in omnibus omnia semper
Christus erit. Quod si pulchrum et super omnia magnum est,
Cur pudet hac etiam, fletus in valle, potentes
Esse Deo, minimumque operis mortalis habere,
Quod non est nisi peccatum. •

‡ The last years of his long and laborious life Augustin had set apart for completing the theological works which were partly connected with these disputed points which seemed to him so important. As the multiplied engagements of his episcopal office left him no leisure for this, he, with the consent of his community, made arrangements to have his labours lightened by the assistance of Eraclius, a presbyter educated under his own eye. He was occupied during this time in preparing a critique on all his own writings (his retractationes). What led him to engage in this work was doubtless the fact that many passages from his earlier writings were cited against him, especially by Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians; whence his enthusiastic admirers were embarrassed, since they would not allow that the man whose authority stood so extravagantly high with them could be convicted of any errors. But Augustin himself was far from claiming any such authority for his writings. Such authority was due, according to his judgment, only to the Bible. He says to those extravagant friends, that they laboured to no purpose: they had undertaken a bad cause. They would lose their suit, even if tried before himself (*frustra laboratis, non bonam causam suscepistis, facile in ea me ipso iudice, superamini.* ep. 143 ad Marcellinum.) He rejoiced in

Prosper opposed, it is true, to his adversaries the decisions of the Roman bishops, and of the emperors; but the Semi-Pelagians felt assured that they were not touched or affected by those authorities, for they, in fact, were also opponents of the Pelagian doctrines condemned by those decisions. For this reason Prosper and Hilary sought to establish, in opposition to them, another new church authority. They appealed to the Roman bishop Cœlestin, and entered a complaint to him against presbyters given to disputation and fond of novelty,

the confession, that he had made some progress in truth, and acknowledged several of his earlier errors as such, which he was not now ashamed publicly to expose in his writings. Unquestionably it was true also, as may be gathered from what has been already remarked, that his mind, more fettered and confined in several respects, now represented as error what at an earlier period had been conceived with more freedom, or that he unconsciously interpreted his earlier views as being in accordance with his present altered way of thinking.

Next, he employed himself on his last work in the Pelagian controversy with Julian, which he was unable to finish. He wrote for this work amid the violent political agitations which brought devastation and ruin over this flourishing portion of the world. He had the pain of seeing the misery proceed from a man who had once been one of his most beloved friends. The count (comes) Bonifacius, one of the most distinguished and successful generals of the Roman empire in its decline, had been led by the advice of Augustin himself, instead of retiring to the monastic life, to the resolution of devoting his powers still further to the defence of the oppressed Roman Christendom against the incursions of barbarian tribes. But by the intrigues of his rival in military renown, the general Aëtius, he had been afterwards drawn into the great mistake of rebelling against the imperial government; and, for the purpose of maintaining himself in this contest, he invited over the Vandals to his assistance from Spain. Augustin availed himself of a favourable opportunity of addressing himself to the conscience of Boniface, in a letter written with true Christian dignity, and with great wisdom (a true model of proceeding in such intricate circumstances). The latter was compelled to find out by bitter experience the truth of that which his old friend had predicted to him. He was carried further than he meant to be, and when he endeavoured to retrace his steps, found it to be too late. The Vandals looked upon the flourishing country as their own property, and, from being the allies of Boniface, became his enemies. Augustin's episcopal residence, the city of Hippo, was besieged by them. Amidst these sufferings, and in sight of the new trials which were threatening him, it was Augustin's daily prayer, that God would deliver the city from the enemy, or bestow on his servants the power to endure everything which his will had in store for them; or that he would grant him a release out of the present world. The last event happened. In the third month of the siege, which lasted fourteen months in all, Augustin died, at the age of seventy-six, A.D. 429.

who propagated false doctrines, and presumed to attack the memory of Augustin. They probably hoped to obtain from the Roman bishop a distinct response in favour of the system of Augustin, against the Semi-Pelagian principles concerning grace, and concerning free-will, but their expectations were not fulfilled. Cælestin, it is true, in answer to this application, published, in the year 431,* a letter to the Gallic bishops. In this letter he complains that several presbyters, of whom he speaks with some contempt, had taken the liberty to set in agitation certain curious questions.† Quite in the spirit of the Roman church, he considers it a great scandal that presbyters should wish to set themselves up as teachers of the bishops; and he ascribes it chiefly to the fault of these latter that presbyters presumed to make themselves so important. Doubtless it might be, he says, that some of them had but recently left the ranks of the laity, and hence had not yet become fully aware of what belonged to them as bishops. And he intimates a suspicion, which the accusers of the Semi-Pelagians had probably found it convenient to insinuate, that several among themselves might be inclined to the same errors. He moreover expressed, in strong terms, his respect for Augustin, who, by his predecessors also, had been considered to belong among the most eminent teachers of the church. But notwithstanding all this, the decisions of the Roman bishop were still so indefinite, that the opponents of Semi-Pelagianism could derive from them but little advantage. Cælestin, indeed, forbore to enter into a particular description of the doctrines of those presbyters against whom he inveighed. What he understood by the expression "curious questions," was left wholly in the dark; and the Semi-Pelagians accused their opponents of this very thing; namely, that instead of holding fast to matters of practical moment they busied themselves with such questions. He had said, let the spirit of innovation—adding, if there is such a

* As he himself alleges, he had already on some earlier occasion decided in like manner, in a *responsum* to a certain bishop Tuentius, which has not reached our times.

† Indisciplinæ questiones. All questions on the subject why God bestowed his grace on some and not on others; all such questions, which were not to be disposed of by reference to the secret incomprehensible councils of God, belonged, in fact, according to the judgment of such men as Prosper, to this class; and Cælestin here speaks at first only in the language of his accusers.

spirit—cease to attack the ancient doctrine.* But still it was left undefined what was to be understood by the ancient and what by the novel doctrines. The Semi-Pelagians, in fact, also asserted—and they could do it with even more justice than their opponents—that by them the ancient doctrine of the church was defended against the false doctrine recently introduced concerning absolute predestination, and against the denial of free will; tenets wholly unknown to the ancient church. As a matter of course, therefore, the Semi-Pelagians might interpret these decisions as being in favour of their own scheme of doctrine; and so, accordingly, they did interpret them.† The Vincentius, already mentioned, who had been educated at a cloister on the island of Lerins in Provence, which was one of the most distinguished seats of Semi-Pelagianism, seems also to have given the decision this interpretation: and it was, perhaps, at the fiercest stage of this controversy, in the year 434,‡ that he wrote his famous *Commonitorium*, if not with the single, yet with the special or partial, design of applying a principle to the refutation of Augustin's doctrine of predestination, which was recognized by Augustin himself; namely, that the subjective views of a church-teacher, however holy and highly gifted, could yet establish nothing in opposition to the ancient and hitherto universally-prevailing doctrine of the church; and that such views would ever continue to be nothing more than private opinions, unless accompanied by the marks of antiquity, universality, and general consent (*antiquitas, universalitas, consensio*).§

Since Hilary and Prosper had now made a journey to Rome

* *Desinat, si ita res sunt, incessere novitas vetustatem.*

† Prosper himself, in his book against Collator (s. 3), gives it to be understood that many Semi-Pelagians, by a *maligui interpretatio*, contrived to explain this decision of the Roman bishop to their own advantage. Cœlestin—said they, as it would seem as if we must gather from his language—had by no means approved, by that eulogium of Augustin, all his writings with reference to the doctrines which they contained; and if he approved the earlier ones, he could not the later, in which Augustin himself set the *novitas* in opposition to the *vetustas*.

‡ See chap. XLII, his own chronological statement.

§ Vincentius enables us to discover his connection with the Semi-Pelagian party, by naming among the false teachers Pelagius and Cœlestius, but not their pretended off-shoots the Semi-Pelagians; and by neglecting to mention Augustin among the many church-teachers who are praised by him. Thus now, too at the end of the second section of

for the express purpose of procuring a favourable decision, and we may take it for granted they would spare no pains to accomplish their object, we may the more confidently conclude that the Roman bishop had good reasons for not expressing himself more definitely and decidedly on this disputed question, when he had assumed a tone so entirely different in the Nestorian controversy.* The only course which remained for Prosper was to contend against the Semi-Pelagians with the

his *communitorium*, of which only a fragment has been preserved, he cites those passages from the letter of Cælestin to the French bishops. Although he does not explain any further, even in this passage, what Cælestin meant by the term "*uovitas*," but chooses to leave the more particular application to each individual himself; yet he certainly betrays here the Semi-Pelagian forced by the authority of Augustin to tread somewhat too softly. A person of the same temper with Prosper would have expressed himself doubtless in this case more strongly and distinctly, and the more, as he must have been aware that his opponents turned the vagueness of that passage to their own account. Moreover, in explaining the phrase, "*si ita res est*," he discovers the Semi-Pelagian, who considered the charge to be without foundation. Most probably it was from this Vincentius that the *capitula objectionum Vincentianarum* proceeded, against which a small tract of Prosper was directed.

* If the collection of decisions by Roman bishops and North-African councils against the doctrines of Pelagius and Cælestius, which is united in several of the older collections of ecclesiastical laws with this letter of Cælestin, really belonged to the same, Cælestin would beyond all question have expressed himself in a more distinct manner; for this collection has manifestly for its object to establish the whole Augustinian scheme of the doctrine of grace in opposition to the Semi-Pelagians; because these accused Augustin of having over-stepped the proper limits, and because they, moreover, contrived to interpret the authority of the Roman bishops in their own sense. But the way in which Cælestin's letter concludes, shows clearly that nothing was to follow after. In this additional clause itself is exhibited a different tone of language from that which we are accustomed to meet with in Roman bishops; and Prosper, who, as we have remarked, appeals to the letter of Cælestin, would assuredly not have omitted to mention this clause, if he had known it as one which proceeded from Cælestin. We cannot doubt, therefore, that this piece is a later addition; and from whomsoever it might be, that this certainly very old appendix, belonging to the very time of these controversies, proceeded, it still remains worthy of notice that its author professes indeed the doctrine of that grace of God from whose agency nothing is to be excluded, but that he does not, however, declare himself in favour of the doctrine of absolute predestination; but rather expressly avoids the inquiry as unprofitable, when he says: *Profundiores vero difficilioresque partes incurrentium questionum, quas latius pertractarunt, qui hæreticis resisterunt, sicut non audemus contemnere, ita non necesse habemus adstruere.*

productions of his pen;* but, as in a case where the tendencies of Christian feeling and of the reflections springing therefrom were so entirely opposed to each other, there could be no chance for a common understanding between Prosper and his opponents; and his own arguments had quite as little weight with them as theirs with himself; and as Cœlestin's decision had so very much disappointed his expectations; he endeavoured to prevail on Sixtus, the successor of Cœlestin, to finish the work of his predecessors, and annihilate the last remains of Pelagianism. As his predecessors had suppressed the open Pelagians, so Sixtus ought to suppress altogether the concealed Pelagians, since this work had been reserved for him by divine Providence.† But neither did he succeed as yet in carrying this point.

The writings of Prosper suggest one remark, important in its bearing on the course and progress of this controversy. On the one hand, the Semi-Pelagians endeavoured so to represent the doctrine of absolute predestination as to bring most prominently to view the point in which it grated most harshly on the Christian feelings, namely, its irreconcilableness with the Christian ideas of God's holiness and love. They affirmed that, according to this doctrine, God had created only a small portion of mankind for eternal happiness, and the rest for damnation; God had predestinated these latter to sin; he was the author of sin; Christ had died not for the salvation of all men, but only for the redemption of this small and determinate portion of them. On the other hand, Prosper laboured with great skill and effect to avoid everything in the exposition of this scheme which might seem repulsive to the Christian feelings; although we must admit he rather concealed all the difficulties by happy turns and forms of expressions, than really avoided them in the material contents of the thought. The charge, that God was made the author of sin, he evaded, as

* His writings against Cassian, *liber contra Collatorem*, his *responsum ad capitula Gallorum*, the tract already mentioned against Vincentius, his *epistola ad Rufinum*.

† *Innocentio cæt., operetur in Sixto, et in custodia Dominici gregis hæc sit pars gloriæ huic reservata pastori, ut sicut illi lupos abegere manifestos, ita hic depellat occultos.*—*Hujusmodi hominum pravitati non tam disputationum studio, quam auctoritatum privilegio resistendum est.* C. Collator. c. 21, s. 4.

Augustin had done, by deriving all sin from a free act of Adam. God's predestination and his foreknowledge were by no means to be considered as identical. In reference to that which has its ground in God himself, goodness, as the bestowment of his grace, and just judgment, were undoubtedly both one; But the case was otherwise in reference to sin, which has its ground in the will of the creature, and in relation to this we can speak only of the divine foreknowledge. But should any be now disposed to find an arbitrary will standing in contradiction with the idea of a holy God, in the fact, that of those who stood in the like condition of alienation from him, he rescued some by his grace, and left the others to their merited destruction, Prosper answers: Men's minds would easily be set at rest, were it but held fast as an incontrovertible maxim of faith, that with God there is no place for arbitrary will: nothing he does can stand in contradiction with his holiness and justice; and that no salvation is to be found without the grace of Christ.* But as our Theodicee must fail to explain many things which take place in the life of nations and of individuals, while still we are not perplexed or hindered in our faith in God's wisdom and holiness; so here, too, we must cling fast to our faith, although it may be impossible for us to fathom or comprehend the councils according to which God dispenses that grace. Well for us, could we but acknowledge the limited nature of our present knowledge of divine

* If indeed Prosper had been disposed to proceed consistently after the same manner in which he derived his conception of grace, as opposed to the Semi-Pelagian views, from the doctrine of an almighty power of God excluding everything of the nature of conditions, and of an absolute dependence of the creature, he must have come at last to consider all the inward operations of God on human nature as absolutely unconditioned from the first, and at every point of time, and accordingly also, as wholly excluding, even in the case of Adam, the free self-determination of the will. See the remarkable passage in the *carmen de ingratiss*, v. 370. We ought not to regard God's agency upon man, says he, as so feeble a thing as that of one man upon another, when by his words he seeks to produce love or hatred or any other affection in the heart of another, so that the speaker is unable really to communicate this affection to the other, but it depends on the other to yield himself to this affection or not. It is not so with divine grace, which is almighty: this employs all subordinate causes only as its instruments, is not dependent on them.

*Ipsa suum consummat opus, cui tempus agendi
Semper adest, quæ gesta vel.it. non moribus illi
Fit mora, non causis anceps susperditur ullis.*—v. 384.

things.* Prosper charged his opponents, as they did him, with attempting, in opposition to the apostle Paul, to explore the 'unsearchable judgments of God.† He said, instead of searching into the deep things of the hidden God, and losing ourselves in a labyrinth of unanswerable questions, we ought rather to employ our thoughts on the ample range of revealed grace; and hold fast to that which the apostle Paul declares: God wills that all men should be saved. This will of God is revealed in the fact of his having provided men with all the means of coming to the knowledge of himself, whether it is revelation by the gospel, by the law, or by the works of creation. But, verily, by all these means, they cannot be led to salvation without the grace which gives them faith. Thus was there here already brought to view, the germ of that distinction between a will of God universally revealed and *conditioned*, and a secret, special, and *unconditioned* will of God; the former being, in fact, taken up and absorbed by the latter. All these shifts and turns were not strictly peculiar to Prosper; but we here discern in him only the apt and skilful disciple of Augustin—a disciple who well understood how to seize, to combine, and to distribute the scattered thoughts of his master.

This tempered exhibition, aiming to avoid the repulsive aspects of the Augustinian scheme, which proceeded from Prosper, had manifestly an important influence on the course of this controversy. Out of the germs contained in the writings of Prosper was formed a still more refined and happily conceived exhibition of this system, executed with great spirit, and based upon conciliatory motives. This is set forth in a work entitled, *The call of all the nations* (*de vocatione omnium gentium*), the author of which is not certainly known.‡ This work evidently proceeded, as the author himself intimates in the introduction, from a person who was seeking to bring

Non ergo instamus clausis nec aperta procaci
Urgemus cura, satis est opera omnipotentis
Cernere et auctorem cunctorum nosse bonorum.—v. 740 et s.

† Reponsio ad capitula Gallorum. c. viii. Profitentur sibi scrutabilia judicia Dei et vestigabiles vias ejus.

‡ The comparison of this remarkable work with the writings of Prosper shows, without doubt, a great agreement between the former and the latter in fundamental ideas; and many single thoughts also occur with the same application in the two kinds of writing. But the author seems to be a person who had not previously taken part in these disputes, but

about a réconciliation between the two parties so fiercely opposed to each other, and that certainly with a decided leaning to the Augustinian system of doctrine, for the fundamental ideas of which he laboured to procure a more general admission, by exhibiting them in a dress and in a combination peculiar to himself; taking pains to divest them of everything which exposed them to the censures of the Semi-Pelagians, and which served to give those censures a more plausible appearance. That he might more easily effect his object, to act as a mediator, he refrained from all allusion to Augustin, though the authority of that father must certainly have stood very high with him. In general, he was remarkably distinguished for his predominant dialectic method, which was independent of all church authorities.

He endeavoured, in the first place, to show that an entire harmony subsisted between the doctrines of grace and of free will, so that the one could not be maintained without

who, after they had been going on now for a long time, felt himself called upon to make the experiment, whether he could not by a certain mode of exhibition provide some way for reconciling the opposite views on the disputed doctrines. This does not suit the case of Prosper, who from the first had been at the head of one of the two parties. Moreover, it does not accord with the character of Prosper, as it appears in his acknowledged and genuine writings, that the author of the work in question refrains from all violent attacks upon his opponents; that he cites absolutely no authorities, and passes over Augustin in entire silence. To this must be added the difference of style. Now, it is true that ancient manuscripts ascribe the work to Prosper; but, on the other hand, there are still older ones which ascribe it to Ambrose, to whom it could not be ascribed without a sorry anachronism. It is accordingly evident that the authority of manuscripts cannot pass in this case as historical testimony. Owing to its contents, the work excited a great sensation,—hence, too, the Roman bishop Gelasius cites it among the books of approved orthodoxy. But inasmuch as there was no historical tradition respecting the author's person, Gelasius himself citing it as an anonymous work, men were readily disposed to ascribe it to some approved church-teacher, and it was at least a more felicitous and well-grounded conjecture which made Prosper its author. If we follow the internal evidence, a certain resemblance of thought and expression gives some colour of probability to the conjecture of Quesnel, that Leo the Great wrote this book while he was a deacon. But in this case the fact that the work should still remain anonymous is still more surprising; and it may be asked whether everything is not sufficiently explained, if we suppose that the book was written by a theologian, unknown to us, belonging to the second half of the fifth century, and who was an earnest student of the writings of Prosper and of Leo the Great.

the other. Take away the free will, and no organ would be left for the expression or existence of the true virtues. Take away grace, and the fountain-head would be wanting, from whence everything truly good must flow. * He next proceeds to distinguish three different bents of will, and corresponding positions of men. The lowest stage or position is that of a will directed solely to the things of sense (the *voluntas sensualis*); next follows the will, which rises above the things of sense, but is still left to itself, and bent on its own ends (*voluntas animalis*)—the will which has not, as yet, been attracted and pervaded by the godlike element. The more active man's changeable will, the more easily is it carried away by evil, so long as it is not governed by the unchangeable will of God. The third stage or position is that of a will attracted and actuated by the godlike—the will which the Spirit of God, with whom the man has come into communion, employs as his organ (the *voluntas spiritalis*). By virtue of this, man comes to refer himself, his whole life, and everything else, to God alone, and loves in all things only the godlike. This will is the incipient germ of all virtue. Here all becomes divine and all human; divine in reference to him who has bestowed it, human in reference to him who has received it.* Grace, which bestows this divine life on man, works upon and within him, not by a compulsory or magical influence, but in a way altogether in harmony with the laws of his nature. The nature of the human will, as such, has not been destroyed by the fall—its form remains the same; and it is simply by appropriating this, that grace works upon him and within him. At first, it operates in various ways, to prepare the will so as to be ready to receive its gifts;† for without the co-operation of the will there can be no virtue.

* *Omnis actio ad unum refertur, et quod ad unum refertur utriusque est quia nec a Deo alienari potest quod dedit nec ab homine quod accepit.* A like sentiment is found in the letter to Demetrius (which, too, was falsely ascribed to Ambrose, but seems to have come from the same author): *Implet Spiritus Sanctus organum suum, et tanquam fila chordarum, tangit digitus Dei corda sanctorum.* This moral fellowship of man with God is represented, as in the quotation made above from Prosper, to be an anticipation of the eternal life on earth: *Nec dubie ista subjectio jam ex magna parte in illius futuræ beatitudinis est constituta consortio, ubi Deus erit omnia in omnibus.*

† *Ut in eo quem vocat, primum sibi receptricem et famulam donorum suorum præparet voluntatem.*

Now this work distinguishes two kinds of grace; and this distinction itself belongs to the peculiarity of the method whereby the author seeks to banish the appearance of *particularism* from the system of Augustin; although the peculiarity in this case consists merely in the form of expression and the more complete exposition, — the principal thoughts having been presented already by Prosper. He institutes a distinction, to wit, between general grace* and special grace.† By the first, God leads all men to the knowledge of himself; and thereby he reveals his will, that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved. This general grace consists in the revelation which God has made of himself to the rational spirit by the works of creation.‡ But the sense and import of this outward revelation of God could still be only understood by man by virtue of the inner revelation of God in the human heart, only through the consciousness of God in the mind itself. Thus it came about that the greatest portion of mankind neither understood nor followed this law of God; and by *these* visible testimonies also we must learn, that the letter killeth, and that the spirit only maketh alive. The author recognizes, then, a universal inward revelation of God as the original source of all religion; but inasmuch as men, by the darkening of their own understandings, became estranged again from this heavenly light shining within them, this sense of God was again suppressed or falsified.§ It still remains true, that none can attain to salvation otherwise than by that special grace (*gratia specialis*) by which man's will

* *Gratia generalis, generalia gratiæ auxilia.*

† *Gratia specialis, dona, auxilia specialia.*

‡ *Implente omnia Spiritu Dei, in quo vivimus, movemur, et sumus.*
 Per quæ humanis cordibus quædam æternæ legis tabulæ præbebantur, ut in paginis elementorum ac voluminibus, temporum, communis et publicæ divinæ institutionis doctrina legeretur.

§ *Quod illuminante Dei gratia invenerant, obcæcante superbia perdidērunt.* Relapsi a superna luce ad tenebras suas. In the letter to Demetrius: In pulchritudine cœli et terræ quædam sunt paginæ, ad omnium oculos semper patentes, et auctorem suum nunquam tacentes, quarum protestatio doctrinam imitatur magistrorum et eloquia scripturarum. Sed quid (quid) illud est, quo corporeorum sensuum exteriora pulsanter, in agro cordis, cui impenditur ista cultura, nec radicem potest figere, nec germen emittere, nisi ille summus et verus agricola potentiam sui operis adhibuerit et ad vitalem profectum quæ sunt plantata perduxerit.

becomes transformed through faith in Christ into a spiritual will. If we ask why this grace is imparted to some and not to others among the great mass of mankind, who are alike alienated from God, and how this is to be reconciled with God's revealed will that all should be saved, we can obtain no other answer than that here, as in innumerable other cases, we perceive the fact, without being able to explore the cause; that, as in innumerable other things, knowledge lingers behind faith; that our knowledge is but in part. We must stand fast by the faith, that God everywhere acts according to his own infinite justice and wisdom; although the question *how* may be wholly beyond the reach of our penetration. In this very thing it behooves us to show the strength of our faith in God's justice and wisdom, that by these difficulties, which admit of no solution in our present earthly life, we still do not suffer ourselves to be perplexed or disturbed.* When we are so disposed as neither to deny the things which are revealed nor to explore those that are hidden, we find ourselves in the right relation to truth.

While, as we have described, the prudent defenders of Augustin's scheme were particularly interested in carefully guarding against all those conclusions calculated to revolt the religious and moral feelings common to all men, and so easily capable of being shown to be practically mischievous, which had been charged upon the system by its enemies; so it was natural, on the other hand, that the opponents would be very unwilling to be deprived of an advantage which, on account of the impression it produced on most minds, was so important to them, and, in spite of all these logical distinctions which had been brought to bear against them, would still believe themselves obliged not to give up the defence and justification of these conclusions. When we learn, then, that writers of a decidedly Semi-Pelagian stamp, living in Gaul in the last half of the fifth century,† represent those very tenets which were

* *Latet discretio nis ratio; sed non latet ipsa discretio. Non intelligimus judicantem; sed videmus operantem. Quid calumniamur justitiæ occultæ, qui gratias debemus misericordiæ manifestæ?—Quanto hoc ipsum difficiliore intellectu capitur, tanto fide laudabiliore creditur.*

† As for example, the younger Arnobius, presently to be mentioned, author of the *Prædestinatus*. *Commentar. in Psalm cxlvi. f. 327, bibliotheca patrum Lugdun. T. VIII. Nota tibi, Prædestinate, quod loquor—and Faustus Rhegiensis.*

repudiated by the above-named defenders of Augustin's scheme, and called unfair inferences from their doctrine, as the tenets of a newly-risen sect, styled *Prædestinatians* (*Prædestinati* or *Prædestinatiani*), we might be easily led to conjecture that the *Prædestinatians*, so called, were none other than the defenders of Augustin's doctrine of predestination; that their opponents in this period, as in earlier times, took the liberty of charging them with their own inferences from the doctrine they taught, as this doctrine itself; and that they invented a distinctive sectarian name for the defenders of such a doctrine, in order that they might stigmatize it as heretical, without seeming to interfere with the universally acknowledged authority of Augustin, and thus also convert the detested doctrine of predestination itself into a heresy. This conjecture would seem to be confirmed by our observing that those persons who speak of a heresy of the *Prædestinatians*, in no way distinguish the doctrine of predestination, apprehended according to its original sense, from such extravagant inferences derived from it; but ever speak of the doctrine of absolute predestination, in itself considered, only as a doctrine apprehended in that form in which it appears to them as a *Prædestinarian* heresy.* But the mere possibility of such an explanation would still not warrant us in the conclusion that the fact was actually so. It would certainly not be unnatural to conceive, that all the advocates of the doctrine of absolute predestination would not conduct with the prudence and caution of an Augustin, a Prosper, and the author of the book *De vocatione gentium*. A doctrine like this might, in its further spread, easily gain fanatical adherents, who, abandoning themselves to a single one-sided direction of religious feeling, would assume an offensive position to the harmonious sentiment of religion, as it is grounded in the essence of man's nature. and was brought to consciousness by Christianity; and thus suffer themselves to be misled into the error of pushing the doctrine of absolute predestination, in their own statement of it, to that revolting extreme of harshness. Zealots, who were ready to sacrifice to their interests for this single Christian dogma the interests of the universal

* Thus the two things are put together by Arnobius in ψ . 117, f. 305: *Prædestinationem docere et liberum hominis arbitrium infringere, libertatem arbitrii ita excludere, ut peccantes existimet Dei abiectione peccare.*

Christian faith, might, especially by their uncompromising opposition to Semi-Pelagianism, be driven to this extreme, as the like has often happened in other cases. Now an appearance of the doctrine they so detested in this new form would be extremely welcome to the Semi-Pelagians, since they could take advantage of it for the purpose of representing their own inferences from the doctrine as the actual tenets of the party they contended against, and as their prevailing, generally acknowledged principles; and their own interest would naturally prevent them from making the distinction which justice required between the genuine and spurious disciples of Augustin. But, after all, it must still remain doubtful, whether in truth there was a sect of Predestinians in the sense above described, or whether the existence of such a sect was merely an invention due to the Semi-Pelagian unfairness of inference. The reasons for and against the latter presumption would still continue to counterbalance each other, and we should still want the documentary evidence necessary to establish the existence of such a sect. This evidence, however, has been found, since the publication of a small tract, composed by one of these Predestinians, in which the mode of thinking and of expression peculiar to these people is very clearly set forth.* In this book, the doctrine of absolute predestination is certainly expressed in the sternest asperity, and every possible expression purposely sought after which can grate on the moral feelings. The work not only departs throughout, in style of representation, from the style and method of Augustin, so distinguished for logical skill and a delicate regard to the moral feelings; but also a difference of doctrine on one point lies at the basis of its whole peculiarity of representation. The principles expressed in it lead to the hypothesis of a divine pre-determination, cutting off all free self-determination from the creature, and all contingency. But such delicacy of moral feeling can hardly be supposed in *this* writer, as we find in Augustin, which would lead him to be inconsistent with himself, and make the will of Adam an exception from that principle.† He knew of no difference betwixt foreknowledge and

* The second book of the work entitled *Prædestinatus*, published by the Jesuit, Sirmond, 1643.

† Probably here, too, we have a forerunner of the Supralapsarians, afterwards so called.

predestination. God predestined man to righteousness or to sin ; since otherwise we must suppose that God, without foreknowledge, created men who could act differently from what he pleased. God remains undefeated in his will, while, on the other hand, man is constantly defeated. If, then, you acknowledge that God cannot be defeated in his counsels, you must also acknowledge that men cannot be other than that for which God has created them. Hence we conclude, that those persons whom God has once destined to life, even though they are neglectful, though they sin, though they *will* not, shall yet, against their will, be conducted to life ; but those whom he has predestined to death, although they run, although they hasten, yet labour in vain. He gives the following illustration : " Judas heard daily the word of life ; he daily lived in the society of our Lord ; he daily heard his admonitions, daily witnessed his miracles ; but because he was predetermined to death, he was suddenly overthrown by a single blow. Saul, on the other hand, who daily stoned the Christians, and laid waste their churches, was suddenly made a vessel of election, because he had been predestined to life. Why fearest thou then," he proceeds, " thou who continuest in sin ? If God vouchsafes it, thou shalt be holy. Or why art thou, who livest a holy life, overburthened with concern, as if thy concern could preserve thee ? If God does not will it, thou shalt not fall." Perhaps with reference to the Semi-Pelagian opponents, who were so highly respected as zealous monks, he says : " Wilt thou, who art holy, and takest pains that thou mayest not fall, who busiest thyself day and night with prayer, fasting, reading of the scriptures, and all manner of holy discipline, wilt thou be saved by these efforts of thine ? Wilt thou be holier than Judas ? Cease, O man ! cease, I say, to be careful for thy virtue, and securely confide on the will of God." With a view to extol predestination and the arbitrariness of grace, he depreciates the work of redemption. Human nature was so entirely corrupted by the fall of Adam, that it obtained a restoration by Christ, not in reality, but merely in hope.

The writer who has been the means of transmitting to us this remarkable book, together with a preliminary brief description of the most important older heresies,* and a refuta-

* Among these are to be found, indeed, some Pelagians ; but the

tion of the book in question, was evidently a Semi-Pelagian ; and expresses with great freedom and boldness his own doctrinal views, which differ entirely from those of Augustin. He holds to a prevenient grace only in so far as is meant by it, the grace—preceding all merit on man's part—manifested in redemption, without which no man could obtain salvation.* The grace of God, too, bestows immeasurably more than all that we can do, to make ourselves befitting subjects of it; but still it depends on the will of the individual whether he receives it or not. It is the same as when one distributes alms, and is willing to bestow them on all, if they will but stretch forth their hands to take what is offered. Would a poor man, then, who has run forward, taken the alms, and thereby become rich, be able to say : I have become rich by my own labour, because I willed and ran? No. He would be obliged to say : I have received nothing on the score of the desert of my willing or running ; but I am indebted for all solely to the grace of him who bestowed his gifts on me. In this sense are to be understood the words of the apostle Paul, in Romans ix. 16. In opposition to those Predestinarians who had adduced the conversion of Paul as an example of grace operating in a sudden and irresistible manner, he endeavours to show, that for this operation of grace the way had been prepared, and the necessary conditions provided, in the antecedent bent of the will of Paul ; for, although he persecuted the Christians, yet that which impelled him to do so was a burning zeal—though a zeal misguided by want of correct knowledge—for the cause of God, 1 Tim. i. 13, not, as the Predestinarians supposed, a spirit of Cain, but a spirit of Elijah, which already contained the germ of the apostolic spirit.†

According to the testimony of this Semi-Pelagian, the Predestinarian tract above mentioned was forged under the name of Augustin, and had been already condemned by the sentence of the Roman bishop Cœlestin. The adherents of the Predestinarian doctrine, who are represented as being extremely few in number, are said to have circulated this tract stealthily,

Semi-Pelagians, to whom the author himself belonged, are of course wanting. The Prædestinarians constitute the ninetieth and last heresy.

* *Quin non haberet homo hoc ipsum velle, nisi unigenitus nobis de cœlo veniens, omnibus officinam suæ gratiæ reserasset.*

† *Jam meritis apostolicis plenus, vas electionis erat.*

as containing a doctrine which all were not able to comprehend, and by means of it to have opened the way for their opinions, particularly among women.

We must admit the transmission of this Predestination tract by a Semi-Pelagian writer might once more excite our suspicions of its genuineness, and lead us to surmise that the Semi-Pelagian had himself composed the work which he refuted, for the purpose of confirming the report of the Predestination heresy, and of placing that heresy in the most hateful light. But the truth is, that not only the marks of a well-defined, living, and personal character are too plain in this work to admit of any such supposition, but also many passages occur in it which a Semi-Pelagian, who was aiming to exhibit the doctrine of absolute predestination in a hateful light, would certainly have expressed otherwise.* Still, the work is not of that stamp which would lead us to suppose that the author meant to have it considered as a production of Augustin, and this circumstance again is another mark in favour of its genuineness: it is a proof that the Semi-Pelagian ascribed to the work in which he had no hand himself, a design not really intended by the author of it. Furthermore, the advocate of the doctrine of absolute predestination was under no necessity of forging writings under Augustin's name for the purpose of supporting that tenet, since he could find arguments enough in Augustin's genuine productions. The Semi-Pelagian interest was opposed to the acknowledgment of this; it was far more inviting to represent the matter as if it was first necessary to forge a tract under the name of Augustin, in order to gain the advantage of possessing in him a direct witness in favour of that doctrine.†

* The places where predestination is derived from foreknowledge.

† Between the doctrine on these points which is to be found in the commentary of the younger Arnobius, an ecclesiastic who came probably from a cloister of the Semi-Pelagians in Southern France, and the doctrine of the Semi-Pelagian just mentioned, we may certainly discern a very striking agreement. Arnobius, too, represents the grace of redemption generally as being the *gratia præveniens*, the *gratia Dei generalis*, *antecedens omnium hominum bonam voluntatem*. In Ps. cxlvii., f. 327. Moreover, he exhibits the doctrine of absolute predestination only in the form of Predestinationism, and calls the defenders of it heretics. In Ps. lxxvii., f. 280. The commentaries on Ps. cxvii., Ps. cxlvii., and Ps. cxxvi., compared with the second and third books

• Among the distinguished men of the Semi-Pelagian party in the second half of the fifth century belonged *Faustus*, who had been educated as a monk in the cloister of Lerins, and who, in the year 454, became bishop of Rhegium (Reji, Riez)* in Provence; a man who, by his practical Christian spirit and his active and devoted zeal, was the means of great good in that whole region, during a period so signally disastrous to those districts on account of the devastating inroads of wandering tribes. He was drawn into a dispute with a certain presbyter *Lucidus*, who was reckoned among the party of the Predestinarians, and had exhibited the doctrine of absolute predestination in the most uncompromising language.† In vain had *Faustus* attempted by oral argumentations to induce him to recant the errors laid to his charge. At length, however, he was prevailed upon by the authority of a council held at Arles, in 475, to lay down the required confession in negative and positive propositions.‡

of the Predestinatus, prove also that *Arnobius* had this work before him, but the reasons are less for considering him to have been its author.

* This *Faustus* deserves notice also on account of his dispute concerning the corporeality of the soul. He affirmed, as others before him had already done, *e. g.* *Hilary* of Poitiers on *Matth. v. 8*, and even *Didymus* in his work de Trinitate, l. II. c. 4: Οἱ ἀγγελοὶ πνεύματα, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς σῶματα, σῶματα ἐπουράνια διὰ τὸ ἀπείρως ἀπέχιν τοῦ ἀκτίστου πνεύματος;) that God alone is a pure spirit; in the essential nature of finitude is grounded limitation as by time (a beginning of existence), so also by space; and hence all creatures are corporeal beings, the higher spirits as well as souls. He was led by his controversies with the Arians of the German tribes, who were then spreading themselves in these countries, to unfold these views still farther: for he supposed he could demonstrate that if equality of essence with the Father was not ascribed to the Logos, it would be necessary to regard him as a corporeal being. He found an opponent who surpassed him in philosophical spirit, in the presbyter *Claudianus Mamertus* of Vienna, a man on whom the speculative spirit of *Augustin* had exerted a great influence. He wrote against *Faustus* his work *de statu animæ*. Here, too, we may perceive indications of the kindred bent of mind among the Semi-Pelagians, and of the opposition of their way of thinking to that of *Augustin*. So, too, the Semi-Pelagian *Arnobius* (*Commentar. in Ps. lxxvii.*) couples together the attributes: *Solus Deus immensus est et incorporeus*.

† *Faustus* says expressly that the council of Arles was called together for the purpose of condemning the false doctrine of absolute predestination. In the letter to the bishop *Leontius* of Arles, he says: *In condemnando prædestinationis errore*.

‡ Among the last occurs also the following: *Profitetur etiam æternæ ignes et infernales flammæ factis capitalibus præparatos, quia perseve-*

Commissioned by this council and another held in the same year at Lyons, Faustus now endeavoured to expound the correct system of doctrine on the disputed points, in his work *De gratia Dei et humanæ mentis libero arbitrio*.

Although in this book he adopted the Semi-Pelagian mode of exposition above described with regard to the relation of the free-will to grace, yet he unfolded this scheme in a way peculiar to himself. If he did not express himself so distinctly as to satisfy the acute and clear-headed theologian, yet we see represented in him, in a beautiful manner, such a harmonious tendency of Christian feeling, keeping aloof from all partial and exaggerated views, as prevented him from giving undue prominence either to the work of redemption, so as to infringe on that of the creation, or to the work of creation, so as to infringe on that of the redemption. "As the same Being," says he, "is both Creator and Redeemer;" so one and the same Being is to be adored both in the work of creation and of redemption.* Among the attributes which, as expressing

rantes in finem humanas culpas merito sequitur divina sententia. Now, as we may in general infer, from the character of the positive propositions which Lucidus was obliged to confess, the character of the opposite ones which he had taught, or, at least, was accused of having taught, so we may in the same way draw some probable conclusion respecting this proposition. Either Lucidus may have said, in order to set distinctly forth the unconditioned will of God in absolute predestination, that those who died in baptism, and as orthodox members of the Catholic church, though they lived to the very end in wickedness, would still finally be made happy; while those, on the contrary, who among heathen nations had led lives which seemed to be ever so virtuous, would be damned, which indeed was the farthest possible removed from the spirit of Augustin; or he had simply appealed to the fact—as was done also by other advocates of the doctrine of absolute predestination in this period—that while many who had led a virtuous life till near the close of their earthly existence, fell at last, because they lacked the *donum perseverantiæ*, into some grievous sin, died with it cleaving to them, and hence were lost; while others on the contrary, after a vicious life to the end, still repented on the death-bed, and hence attained to blessedness, as belonging to the number of the elect. The practical Christian zeal of Faustus would necessarily move him to take a position directly opposed to such tenets, as, in fact, he was moved thereby to controvert the efficacy of a death-bed repentance in his letter to *Benedictus Paulinus*.

* II. c. 8. *Quum vero ipse sit conditor, qui reparator, unus idemque in utriusque operis præconio celebratur. Jure itaque utriusque rei munus assero, quia scio me illi debere, quod natus sum, cui debeo quod renatus sum.*

the image of God, could not be destroyed in human nature, he reckons pre-eminently the free-will. But even before the fall, the free-will was insufficient without the aid of grace, and still less can it at present, since sin has entered, suffice by its own strength for the attainment of salvation. It has now lost its original power, yet it is not, in itself, destroyed; it is not altogether shut out from the divine gifts, but only it must strive once more to obtain them by intense efforts and the divine assistance. Like the author of the work *De vocatione gentium*, he makes a distinction between general grace (*gratia generalis*), a term by which he designates the religious-moral capability which God has furnished to man's nature, and which, too, has not been wholly supplanted by sin, as well as the universal inward revelation of God by means of this universal religious-moral sense, between general grace so understood, and special grace, by which he means all that was first bestowed on mankind through Christianity. But the relation of these two kinds of grace to each other is defined by him quite otherwise than it is in the work above mentioned. Although, as a general thing, the grace of redemption, and in many cases, also, the calling is antecedent to all human merit, still the operation of that special grace in man is dependent on the manner in which he has used that general grace; and in many cases the striving and seeking of the man which proceeds from the former, the self-active bent of the free-will, is antecedent to that which is imparted to the man by this special grace; a thing which Faustus endeavours to show by examples similar to those which the Semi-Pelagians had been accustomed to adduce since the time of Cassian.* He denominates the imperishable germ of good in human nature, a spark of fire implanted within by the divine hand, which, cherished by man, with the assistance of divine grace, would become operative.† He recognizes, therefore, a preparatory development of the religious and moral nature even among the heathen, and controverts those who were unwilling to allow, that by a faithful use of that general grace, the

* *Quod aliquoties in dispositionibus nostris, non quidem in vitæ nostræ primordiis, sed duntaxat in mediis, gratias speciales et ex accedenti largitur venientes voluntas nostra, Deo ita ordinante, præcedat.*

† *Hoc in homine ignis interior a Deo insitus et ab homine cum Dei gratia nutritus operatur.*

heathen might have attained to the true service of God. From this it might also be inferred, that Faustus was an opponent of the doctrine which taught that all the heathen would be unconditionally condemned; and that it was his opinion that the worthy among them would still be led, after the present life, to faith in the Saviour, and thereby to salvation; but on these points he does not express himself more distinctly.

There is much good sense in the remarks of Faustus, where he compares the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the relation of grace to free-will with the two extremes in the mode of apprehending the doctrine concerning the person of Christ. As in the doctrine concerning Christ's person some gave undue prominence to the divine, others to the human, element; and, as the result of so doing, were led into errors which, on opposite sides, injured the doctrine of redemption, so, he says, it was also with the doctrine concerning human nature.

The moderate Faustus was, moreover, unwilling to be regarded as the antagonist of Augustin. He himself cites from the latter a remark, mentioning him with respect, although not with those enthusiastic expressions of reverence which characterize the adherents of the rigid Augustinian scheme.* A contemporary of Faustus, who entertained the same views with himself, ventured to speak much more sharply of Augustin. The presbyter Gennadius of Marseilles, a very moderate Semi-Pelagian,† had the boldness, in his collection of brief notices respecting the church-teachers, to say of Augustin that by writing so much he had fallen into several errors of doctrine, and hence, also, had given occasion to the exaggerated statements of the doctrine of absolute predestination.‡

* He merely says of him (ii. 7): *Beatissimus pontifex Augustinus doctissimo sermone prosequitur.*

† He acknowledges a prevenient grace, which calls men to salvation; but he attributes to the free-will the capacity of choosing by itself the good, or of following the call of grace. *Manet ad quærendam salutem arbitrii libertas, sed admonente prius Deo et invitante ad salutem, ut vel eligat vel sequatur. De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, c. 21.*

‡ *De viris illustribus, c. 38.* Multa loquenti accidit, quod dixit per Salomonem Spiritus Sanctus: *In multiloquio non effugies peccatum, Prov. x. 19.* And when he speaks afterwards of an error illius sermone multo contractus, he evidently means the doctrine of predestination, though it cannot be certainly determined, whether by the words *lucta*

• Yet from this same cloister of Lerins went forth also church-teachers who did not remain true to the Semi-Pelagian tendency which there prevailed, but were led along by the study of Augustin, and by the development of their own inward life, to moderate views of Augustin's scheme of doctrine respecting grace, similar to those which are expressed in the book *De vocatione gentium*. At the head of this party stood an individual, whose unwearied, active, and pious zeal, ready for every sacrifice in the spirit of love, and his great and successful labours in a period and under circumstances of universal desolation, had gained for him deserved respect, the bishop Cæsarius of Arles,* who had been drawn to embrace this doctrine simply by *that* tendency of Christian feeling which led him to refer everything to God, and to acknowledge his kindness in every blessing; and since in holding fast only to this interest of practical Christianity, he carefully avoided all the excesses which might do violence to any Christian feeling, he could hardly fail, by this means, of contributing the more towards opening the way for the admission of this scheme of doctrine. Besides this, distinguished bishops and clergymen from the church of North Africa, on whose theological culture the spirit of Augustin had exerted an important influence, warm and zealous adherents of his peculiar scheme of faith, had been driven by the persecution of the Vandals to take refuge in Sar-

hostium exaggeratus, he means to say that he fell into this mistake by exaggeration in controversy, or that this error was afterwards carried to an extreme by the enemies of Augustin, as he would consider the Predestinations to be. Still more obscure are the remarks of Gennadius which follow.

* He became in the year 501 bishop of Arles, died in 542, at the age of 73. As a bishop he was distinguished for his zeal in the business of religious instruction, and that of such a sort as had for its end the advancement of a vital, practical Christianity. These traits of his character we learn from his sermons, which are to be found partly in the fifth volume of the Benedictine edition of Augustin, partly in the collections of the church fathers, and in part have been published by Baluz. A complete collection, critically compiled, of these sermons, conveying so much important information respecting the character of Cæsarius and his times—a fact to which the authors of the *hist. lit. de la France* refer—still remains a desideratum. He is to be ranked along with those other men who knew how to assuage by the glowing zeal of Christian charity, and whatever that can do, even the physical distress of those times of desolation. See his biography by a disciple, at the 27th of August in the *Actis Sanctorum*.

inia and Corsica. Among these the most eminent was Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe in Numidia, who took up his abode in Sardinia. These persons also contributed, by the weight of their authority, to bring about at last a decision of the controversy between the Semi-Pelagian and the Augustinian parties. But the impulse, whereby this whole matter was set in agitation anew, proceeded from two other quarters.

The work of Faustus of Rhegium had found its way among the foreign clergy residing at Constantinople, where it created a lively sensation—some condemning, others defending it. Certain monks from the districts bordering on the Black Sea (Scythian monks, as they were called), who sought to establish their authority everywhere as zealous champions of orthodoxy, fiercely assailed this work also. This was under the reign of the emperor Justin, in 520; and at that time Justinian and Vitalian, men who stood at the head of civil affairs, took a lively part in this, as in all other doctrinal disputes. They induced the North-African bishop Possessor, who resided at Constantinople, to propose the matter in the form of a question to the Roman bishop Hormisdas. The latter replied to the question with a freedom of spirit and moderation, the more remarkable as coming from a bishop of Rome; whether the fact was that these qualities, which did not so eminently characterize him in other relations, were the cause of his conduct, or that he acted according to the policy of Roman bishops, who were never willing to offend any important doctrinal party. This author, he declared, did not belong to the class whom men regarded as fathers of the faith.* But men should treat him as they should every other ecclesiastical writer; that is, adopt whatever he taught which agreed with pure doctrine, and reject whatever was at variance with it. There was but one foundation on which every solid structure should be erected; each must take heed for himself, and see whether he built upon this foundation what was valuable or worthless. Nor was it a censurable thing to peruse writings in which errors were to be found. All that deserved rebuke was when men sought to propagate those errors. On the contrary, it was a laudable diligence when men searched through many writings, and, following the maxim of Paul, examined all things, and held fast that which is good. Oftentimes it was necessary, in order

* Quos in auctoritate patrum recipit examen catholicæ fidei.

to obtain information with regard to that by which opponents might be refuted.* For the rest, he went on to say that various writings of Augustin, and especially his tracts addressed to Hilary and Prosper, were regarded as models of orthodoxy in respect to the doctrines of grace and of free-will, and declared himself ready to transmit to Constantinople specific articles on these points, which represented the doctrine of the Roman church, and which were to be found in the church archives.† Those monks, however, were by no means satisfied with this declaration of the Roman bishop; it seemed to them a self-contradiction to make Augustin's writings a rule of the pure doctrine concerning grace, and yet not condemn the work of Faustus, which was opposed to them. They had the boldness to write with great warmth against the decretals of the Roman bishop, not being able to persuade themselves, as they pretended, that they really proceeded from him.

They sent the work of Faustus to those bishops who had been driven from North Africa, at whose head stood Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, and asked them to signify their agreement with the doctrines expounded by themselves, relative to this and to another subject. Fulgentius was thus led to write several works in refutation of Semi-Pelagianism, and in defence of the system of Augustin, in which he explained and unfolded the latter with logical consistency. Moreover, in doing this he carefully avoided the harsh points of the predestination view of the matter. He severely censured those who talked of a predestination to sin. He spoke, indeed, of a two-fold predestination (*prædestinatio duplex*); but by this he understood either the election to eternal happiness of those who were good by the grace of God, or the predestination of those who were sinners by their own choice to deserved punishment.

In the south of France, also, this subject was agitated anew; and a synod held at Orange (*Arausio*), in 529, confirmed a scheme of doctrine drawn up by the bishop Cæsarius of Arles,

* *Nec improbatum diligentia per multa discurrens; sed animus a veritate declinans. Sæpe de his necessaria providetur, de quibus ipsi amuli convincantur, instructio, nec vitio dari potest nosse quod fugias; atque ideo non legentes incongrua in culpam veniunt; sed sequentes. Quod si ita non esset, nunquam doctor ille gentium acquievisset nuntiare fidelibus: Omnia probate, quod bonum est, tenete.*

† In scriniis ecclesiasticis expressa Capitula. Perhaps those capitula joined with the decretals of Cælestin.

by whom the doctrine of grace was expounded in opposition to Semi-Pelagianism as well as to Pelagianism ; and hence also the doctrine of prevenient grace, as the cause of even the *first motions* of all goodness, in the strict sense of Augustin. No man, it was asserted, among other things, has anything which can strictly be called his own, but falsehood and sin. But whatever of truth or goodness man possesses flows from that fountain, after which we must thirst in this wilderness, that, quickened and revived by some drops from it, we may not faint by the way. In the spirit of the genuine Augustinian doctrine, it was affirmed that man could not have preserved himself, even in his original condition, without God's assistance. Conformably to the mild, pious spirit of Cæsarius, this council declared strongly against the Predestinarian extravagances, in such expressions as the following :—"That God's power has predestinated certain individuals to sin we not only do not believe, but if there are any who are inclined to believe a doctrine so monstrous, we condemn them with the utmost abhorrence." A following council confirmed these decrees ; and also the Roman bishop, Boniface II., gave them his approbation, and in the letter relating to them, he himself declared that those were off-shoots of Pelagianism who refused to acknowledge prevenient grace to be the cause of faith, but considered that to be a work of the corrupted nature, which, however, could only be a work of Christ.*

Thus had the Augustinian scheme of doctrine concerning grace as the operating cause of all goodness obtained the victory on this side also, over Semi-Pelagianism. But still, the predominant practical Christian tendency of those from whom this victory proceeded in Southern France, was the cause that among these articles nothing was established on the doctrines of absolute predestination and irresistible grace ; while also at Rome there would perhaps be an aversion to express propositions which were abhorrent to the Christian feelings of so many. This latter result of the controversies was important in its influence on the succeeding times ; for thus it could happen, that many, although they received the prevailing scheme of grace, yet on account of the practical objections in their

* Ut ad Christum non credant Dei beneficio, sed naturæ veniri, et ipsius naturæ bonum, quod Adæ peccato noscitur depravatum, auctorem nostræ fidei dicant magis esse quam Christum.

own religious and moral feelings, avoided expressing the doctrine of absolute predestination, which had not been in so many words established by any public determinations of doctrine.

On the development of doctrine in the Oriental church, these controversies peculiar to the West had but little influence, and they excited but little interest, except where more importance came to be attached to them on account of their connection with other disputes, as in the case of the proceedings with Nestorius. Theodore of Mopsuestia alone seems to have taken a lively interest in these controversies, and his participation in them can be rightly understood and judged only when considered with reference to his peculiar views of human nature, which were closely connected with his whole system of doctrine. And here we have to lament that no information, except of the most vague and indefinite character, has reached us respecting his outward relations with regard to the matter in question.

Julian of Eclanum refers in his writings * to his agreement with Theodore. He took pains to visit him, in hopes of being able to unite with him in a system of faith. Theodore himself wrote a work, which was manifestly directed against the advocates of Augustin's system—"against those who affirmed that men sinned from nature and not with design."† This work, as it should seem, was pointed especially against Jerome, whom Theodore represents as the author of that whole new, blasphemous system, according to which, things were asserted of the divine Being which could not possibly be conceived to be so, even in men of ordinary intelligence and uprightness. Jerome, who resided at Bethlehem, might be far better known by him than Augustin, who lived at so great a distance; and hence he ascribes the spread of all these doctrines to the influence of Jerome on the Western church.‡

* Marius Mercator, in his tract on the symbolum Theodori Mopsuesteni, says, in the prefatory letter addressed to the reader, that Julian in his writings bestows unbounded praise on Theodore. He may have done this in writings that are lost; but it may also be an exaggeration. In what still remains to us of the writings of Julian, there is but *one passage* to be found (in Augustin. opus imperfect. l. III. c. iii.) where he names Theodore along with Chrysostom and Basil as witnesses of the truth.

† Παρὰ τοὺς λίγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμῃ πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Phot. cod. 177.

‡ Marius Mercator (opp. ed. Garnier, f. 97) says, that Theodore's

Yet if we follow the account of Marius Mercator, Theodore, at some later period, must have altered his views on these disputed questions; for it is said that he was member of the synod held in Cilicia, at which the sentence of condemnation

work was aimed against Augustin, and a good deal which Theodore said against his opponents, according to the citations of Mercator in his second excerpt, f. 103, may beyond question apply very properly to Augustin: Quippe qui in divinis scripturis nequaquam fuerit exercitatus, nec ab infantia juxta b. Pauli vocem sacras didicerit literas—which seems not to apply so well to Jerome, who at so early an age had already engaged in biblical studies. Sed sive de scripturæ sensibus, sive de dogmate sæpe declamans, multa frequenter inepta de ipsis scripturis dogmatibusque plurimis imprudenter deprompsit; nam potentiæ motus nullum contra sinebat elari; sed tantummodo taciti, qui divinarum scripturarum habebant notitiam, detrahebant. Then concerning the present disputed point: Novissime vero in hanc dogmatis excidit novitatem cæt. But, still, it may be certainly gathered from the notice of the contents of the work in Photius, cod. 177, that the book was aimed against Jerome, whom he calls Aram. In this book he very unjustly objects to Jerome the fifth gospel invented by him (the gospel of the Nazarenes, which he translated); his contempt of the ancient Greek translators of the Old Testament, and his own new translation, undertaken without any knowledge of the sense of the Old Testament, under the influence of earthly-minded Jews. It is possible, indeed, to reconcile the discrepancy between Marius Mercator and Photius, by supposing the work was aimed at one and the same time against Augustin and against Jerome. But, according to Photius, Theodore represented Jerome as being the inventor of this blasphemous system; and he traced the spread of it in the Western church solely to the influence of the writings of Jerome, which were there circulated. And now, on more accurate examination, it will be found, that what he says, according to the report of Mercator, admits very well of being applied to Jerome, nay, a good deal, considering the position held by Theodore, admits better of being applied to him than to Augustin; for when Theodore speaks of absurd opinions which that individual had taken pains to circulate, even before this controversy, it may well be doubted, whether he could have learned so much in this respect with regard to Augustin. On the other hand, with regard to Jerome, who often, for example, followed the allegorical expositions of Origen, he might very early have learnt a good deal which would appear singular enough to him, judged from his own point of view. What he says respecting the despotic influence of the person, applies very well to the relation in which Jerome stood with those around him. And though Jerome had for many years been engaged in biblical studies, yet the Syrian, who was born in a country where the bible constituted the foundation of the earliest training, might be very likely to make this objection to him, especially as he evidently wrote in a violent passion, and even, according to the quotations of Photius, actually allowed himself in so many unjust accusations, grounded in the perversion of facts.

on the doctrines of Julian was pronounced after his departure. But it may be asked whether, and how far, the account which comes from so passionate an author, deserves confidence. It is very possible indeed that Theodore, who in the outset had only glanced at the fact that the Pelagian system was opposed to that of Augustin, and in this respect entirely agreed with it, after having become more accurately acquainted with the system of Julian, observed many points of difference between his own doctrinal scheme and the Pelagian, as in fact the relation of the doctrine of redemption in the two systems constituted an essential difference between them; yet it may still be a question whether, considering the very imperfect knowledge which Theodore could have had respecting the mode of treating doctrinal subjects in the Western church, it was easy for him to become clearly aware of this difference. The affinity as well as the disagreement between the doctrines of Pelagius and of Theodore will be readily seen from a brief statement of the connection of ideas in the Anthropology of the latter.

Theodore ascribed to man the most important place in the evolution of the universe. He was to be the representative and revealer of God for the entire spiritual and sensible creation, the common bond uniting both worlds; a theory in which Theodore approximated nearly to the doctrines of the Gnostics, from which otherwise he was so far removed. After having sought, in his exposition of Genesis, to refute the different explanations given of the image of God in man, as partial and failing to exhaust the whole subject, he approves of this one view as embracing the whole, namely, that man, as in fact the very notion of an image implies, was destined to manifest God, who was represented by him as by an image, to the entire creation—a pregnant idea, which it must be allowed he in part reduced too much within the province and calculations of the understanding, judging by sense: “Just as a monarch,” said he, “after having built a great city and embellished it with many and various works, when the whole is completed, causes a great and magnificent image of himself to be erected in the centre of the city, that its builder may thereby be known—and as all the inhabitants must honour this image in order thereby to express their gratitude to the founder, so the Creator, after he had embellished the world with his manifold works, finally produced man as his own image, to bind together

all the works of creation by their common reference to man's advantage. The elements, the starry host, and the invisible powers, Heb. i. 14, work together for the service of man. Thus man was to form the common bond of union for the whole universe. Both worlds are knit into fellowship by the union of soul and body."* Also, in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, recently published, Theodore expresses the view: "that God formed man with a view of uniting the visible with the invisible in one, and made him, as it were, a pledge of harmony in the universe. For the visible serves to promote his advantage, as we learn from experience itself; but the spiritual powers preside over the sensible, guiding them so as to promote our advantage.† From the position held by man as God's image in the universe, he explains the different relations of the angels to man. In like manner as the servants of the king pay all honour and respect to his image, but the insurgents endeavour to tear it down, so the angels maintain this different bearing towards God's image in man.‡ But, although man was furnished by God with all the requisite faculties for attaining and accomplishing this high destination, as, for example, with reason and free-will; yet still, he was not directly adequate to accomplish it. Human nature, furnished with these faculties, must, in the first place, in order to be able rightly to employ them, be interpenetrated by a principle of divine life. As when left to itself it is exposed, since it is a finite nature, to fickleness and change, it must first be raised above itself by means of communion with God; its spiritual and moral powers must first receive *thereby* an unchangeable direction. And from man this new unchangeable direction was to pass over to the whole spiritual creation. Theodore supposed generally, as we have already remarked, two periods of development in the whole spiritual creation, the

* See J. Philopon. de creatione, vi. 10 and 17, and Theodoret. quæst. in Genesin i. 20. It is evident, from comparing the passages, that Theodoret in this place took the greatest part of what he says from Theodore.

† Βουλόμενος εἰς ἐν τὰ πάντα συνῆθαι, πεποιήκει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὡς πῆρ τι φιλίας ἐνέχυρον τοῖς πᾶσι· χρήσιμα μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὰ φαινόμενα, ὡς αὐτῇ τῇ πείρᾳ μανθάνομεν. Ἐφ' ὧς αὐτοῖς αἰνοῦνται φύσεις πρὸς τὸ ἡμῖν ὠφελίμων αὐτὰ κινεῖν. Spicilieg. Rom. T. IV. en Maji, p. 527.

‡ Οἱ μὲν εὐνοοῦντες ἄγγελοι τῷ Θεῷ προθύμως τὴν διακονίαν. ἐφ' ἣ ἀποστέλλονται πληροῦσι, διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν. ὁ διάβολος δὲ καὶ οἱ δαίμονες πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιβούλην πάντα ποιοῦσιν. Philopon. VI. 10.

changeable state of the spiritual creation left to itself, and the unchangeableness of the spiritual creation interpenetrated by a divine principle of life.* Hence, at the first stage, the appearance of moral evil (the probation to which beings are subjected in their mutability), not merely in the human nature, but also in the higher world of spirits.† It was first through Christ that human nature was to be exalted to that condition of imperishable, immutable divine life;—it was first through him, indeed, that the image of God in human nature was to become realized in its fullest extent. The first man, therefore, could possess no pre-eminence in this respect. He was by his own nature created mortal—as Theodore endeavoured to demonstrate from the essential nature of the human organism; but still God threatened the first man with death, and placed before him death in connection with sin, because this was a wholesome and salutary thing for man's discipline. The omniscient God would not otherwise have given him a command which he foreknew that he would not be able to keep. But he permitted sin, because he knew that this would in the end redound to man's salvation. He proceeded with man, like the wisest and most affectionate father, according to a deeply laid scheme of education. He would lead him, by himself, to the consciousness of his own weakness. He would cause him to come, of himself, to perceive that in his then moral state he was unfitted to sustain an immortal existence, and that this would not make him happy. For this reason death was announced to man by God as the punishment for his disobedience, although God by no means first suspended death over human nature as the punishment of sin; but from the beginning had created it mortal. Man was in the first place to become acquainted with virtue, and learn to practise it by self-development in the practical antagonism between good and evil.‡

* Ap. Marius Mercatorem Excerpt. f. 100. Quod placuit Deo, hoc erat in duos status dividere creaturam; unum quidem, qui præsens est, in quo mutabilia omnia fecit; alterum autem, qui futurus est, cum renovans omnia ad immutabilitatem transferet.

† He referred to versa multoties decem millia daemonum, in which apocryphal book he may have found this.

‡ Vid. Catena Nicephori, I. f. 98. 'Οτι τῷ θνητῷ βίῳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὑπερβίβει, αὐτὸ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ ἄρρενος καὶ τοῦ θήλεος διακινῶν, ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τὴν παιδαγωγίαν εὐθὺς καὶ ἐκ πρώτης δεικνύμενον· ὥστε ἡ μὲν πλάσις ἡτοιμάσθη τῷ θνητῷ βίῳ· ἡ δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς δόσις καὶ τὸ αἰτεχέουσιν προεγύμνασι κα

Theodôre compares the state of the first man, who must be led, by means of a law given to him, to distinguish between good and evil, with the state of all his posterity, to whom laws have been given for the same reason. He compares the sin of Adam with the sins committed by his posterity in the transgression of the law. "The example of Adam," says he, "serves to make clearly apparent the nature of the law. He might have partaken freely of all the fruits, had there not been prescribed to him a law of abstinence; and it was no sin for him to wish to partake of that particular fruit with the rest; but when he received a law bidding him to abstain from eating that fruit, the desire of which however was within him, and when he was restrained by the law, since he held it a sin to eat of what was forbidden,—in this, sin found a foot-hold, inasmuch as the law restrained from eating, but Adam would not look to the reverence due to the law, but believed the words of the tempter, and surrendered himself wholly to the desire of eating. And not only was this occasion of sin to him, but we also may learn from it, that it does not become us to follow the enticements of our desires."* This passage deserves notice, as clearly showing how Theodore conceived of the origin of the first sin wholly after the analogy of every other sin taking place under the ordinary conditions of human life. It is a characteristic exemplification of that mode of apprehension by the understanding after the notices of sense and experience, which was combined with his systematizing spirit. So he says concerning the necessity of the law in the present life, by means of which the power of discrimination within us is excited and called forth, since we learn what we have to shun and what we have to do, so that even the reason within us is active:† "Without the law, there could be no such thing as distinguishing between good and evil; we should, like the irrational brutes, do whatever immediately occurred to us."‡ Death, in the case of all the posterity of Adam, he

ἔδωκε τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγώνων τὴν πρόβασιν καὶ τὸ τῆς θνητότητος συμφέρον ἐδείξεν.

* Comment. in ep. ad Roman. p. 516.

† "Ὅτι ἀναγκαίως μὲν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον νόμοις πολιτευόμεθα· ὅφ' ὃν ἡ ἡμεῖς ἀντιπαρατίθεται διάκρισις, παιδευομένων ὧν τὸ ἀπίχθεσθαι καὶ ἀποιεῖν προσήκει. ὥστε καὶ τὸ λογικὸν ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνεργὸν εἶναι.

‡ L. c. p. 517.

describes as the punishment of each one's own sin; as in commenting on Rom. v. 13, where he says: "Death becomes master of all who have in any way sinned; for although Adam's sin was not the same in kind with the sins of other men, yet the others have not been exempted from death, but in whatsoever way they may have sinned, they have received on this account the sentence of death: for death was not threatened as the penalty of that particular sin, but as the punishment for all sin."* The mortal body under the dominion of sensuous wants he regarded as the source of many temptations to sin. In this sense he explains the words in Rom. v. 21, that sin hath reigned unto death.† Thus he explains the passage in Rom. v. 18: "As Adam's sin made the rest of mankind mortal, and thereby inclined to sin; so Christ has bestowed on us the resurrection, so that we might live in perfect righteousness in an immortal nature free from all sin."‡ Understanding the creation (κτίσις) in Rom. viii. 19, as referring to the angels who became estranged from man by sin, and reconciled with him again by the redemption, he says: "When, by the pronouncement of the sentence, Adam became mortal, the soul became separate from the body, and the union of the creation into one whole, which was to be brought about through man, was dissolved,§ the higher spirits were disturbed, and they were not friendly to us, since we were the guilty cause of so great an evil. But when, in the process of time, men, continually degenerating, drew down on themselves the sentence of death,|| they despaired of us, and conceived a great hatred towards us. Hence, moreover, they were unwilling to do any more for our help, turning their backs upon us as aliens.

* Οὐ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ οὐχ ὁμοῖον ἦν τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας εἶδος τό τε τοῦ Ἀδάμ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων, θάνατον γεγόνασιν ἐκτός οἱ λοιποὶ, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμάρτανον ὁμοσθέντες τοῦ θανάτου τὴν ἀπόφασιν ἰδίξαντο πάντες· οὐ γὰρ τῆς τοιαύτης ἁμαρτίας τιμωρία ὁ θάνατος ὤρεται, ἀλλὰ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. L. c. p. 504.

† Μείζονα περὶ τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν ῥοπήν θνητοὶ γεγονότες ἐσχέκαμεν. L. c. p. 506.

‡ L. c.

§ Ὁ μηχανηθεὶς διὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σύνδεσμος τῆς κτίσεως διελύετο. L. c. p. 528.

|| Ἐπίσφιγγον ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ θανάτου τὴν ἀπόφασιν. This is intended to express the persistency with which they ever continued to make themselves still more worthy of the death which had been once pronounced on them.

What took place after this? The Lord announced to them, that he would work out our restoration, awaken us and make us immortal; so that they need not fear any change and dissolution of the common bond of the creation. Thus they were once more made joyful when they received this promise; when they learned that divine grace would heal the evil brought about by our guilt, and abundantly restore to us what we had lost by our own fault; that then the common bond of the universe would never again be dissolved, and the harmony of creation would remain indestructible. And in this hope—says he—they were ready to do anything for us.”* If we took all this in an isolated manner, and without reference to its connection with the whole system, we should not perceive here that Theodore entertained any peculiar views, differing from those which generally prevailed, on the connection between sin and death.

From this exposition of the anthropology of Theodore, it is plain, that in contending against the system of Augustin, he must have coincided in many points with the Pelagians; and in general, it may be said that many points of coincidence are to be found in their respective doctrines of human nature. There were the same views of the original weakness of man's nature, of the consequences of the first sin, of man's inalienable freedom as opposed to the doctrine of a constraining grace and of predestination. But *the great difference* between the two systems was *this*—that in the Pelagian, the doctrine of a redemption and of a Redeemer had no foothold whatever; while in Theodore's system it had a thoroughly essential one, and indeed constituted the central point of the system. Human nature, nay, the nature of all created spirits is, according to this system, so constituted from the beginning, that it could no otherwise than by a redemption attain to its final destination. Only in the system of Theodore, the Redeemer does not, as in that of Augustin, appear pre-eminently as the restorer of corrupted nature, but as the author of a new creation in the world of men and of spirits, whereby the original creation is raised to a higher development, extending beyond the limits of the finite nature. Grace appears here, not so much to heal and restore nature, as to exalt and to ennoble it.

* Καὶ μὲν . . ὁ καθολοῦ σύνδεσμος διάλυσιν οὐδεμίαν ἐπιτευχόμενος τοῦ λοιποῦ, μινὶ δὲ ἀρρήκτος καὶ τῇ κτίσει πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἡ φιλία. L. c. p. 529.

Hence Theodore could, without any mention of original sin, claim for children also the fellowship of Christ, in order that their natures might be brought to share in those blessings which can flow only from this fellowship of divine life with him. With this idea was intimately connected, indeed, his peculiar mode of apprehending the person of Christ, of which we have spoken before. Hence, according to his theory, in the case of Christ, as in that of all men and of the whole creation, that refinement and elevation of nature which was to be first fulfilled in him, must be conditioned on the antecedent free development of that nature. And in this view of the work of redemption; as being pre-eminently a new ennobling creation, not a healing of corruption, Theodore may in fact have secured a point of union and sympathy generally between himself and what belonged peculiarly to the Oriental church doctrine, which in his system was only more distinctly set forth in opposition to other modes of apprehension, and placed on a more systematic foundation in connection with his whole doctrine of human nature.

It is at the same time also noticeable, that while Theodore so zealously contended against the doctrine of a divine causality of evil, and so strenuously insisted on the doctrine of a self-determining freedom as the condition of all development in the spiritual world, still his principle led him to regard sin as a necessary transition point in the development of the spiritual world, while an ultimate universal destruction of sin by the redemption was at the same time grounded in that system; which last result, as we shall see hereafter, Theodore did in fact actually express with clear consciousness.

From the Antiochian school proceeded Chrysostom; who differed, however, from his early friend Theodore, in possessing a spirit more practical than systematic; and this difference had also an influence especially on his peculiar mode of apprehending the doctrines of which we are here speaking. We find in him that form of doctrine which chiefly prevailed in the Oriental church, and which sprung up there at the same point of time when the Pelagian controversy broke forth in the West. But his mild, predominantly practical, and feebly systematizing spirit, which was strongly disinclined to all stiff and harsh extremes, could also most readily blend with the Oriental mode of apprehension and genially work upon it.

The whole peculiarity of his character, the course of his life and training, would of themselves necessarily keep him at a distance from the system of Augustin. His Christian life and character had not been the result of any such violent crisis as we observed in the case of Augustin; but from his early youth it had harmoniously developed itself under the influence of a profound study of the sacred scriptures, and of pious friends and associates surrounding him with a gentle atmosphere of Christian excitement. By a constantly applied and earnest self-discipline in zealous efforts to attain to the ideal of Christian holiness, as well as by incorporating the holy scriptures into his inner life, and learning to understand them by means of a rich inward experience, by all this he was preserved from the one-sided views of the Pelagian anthropology. He had come to learn from his own inward experience, as well as from a deeper knowledge of scripture, what the essential nature is of that divine principle of life which renovates man's nature. The study of the ancients, and his own free, gentle, and amiable temper, however, had also impelled him to search after all the scattered rays of relationship to God in man's nature while yet unrenewed, and to embrace them with love wherever they were to be found. Charity, the predominant element in his heart, caused that he also, in contemplating the course of development of human nature from the beginning, should look upon the whole, chiefly from that point of view which led him to trace the hand of a paternal disciplinary love; and to this he felt compelled to subordinate punitive justice. The sincere and lively feeling of the need of redemption, which proceeded in his case from the depths of the Christian spirit, led him to recognize the importance of the doctrine concerning grace; but his strong feeling of moral, free, self-determination impelled him, too, to set a high value on the free-will of man, as a necessary condition of all the operations of grace. A Christian stoicism, pervaded and ennobled, however, by the spirit of Christianity, and most intimately conjoined with Christian humility, animated and inspired him. Firm and deeply rooted in him was the conviction, to which he remained true under all trials and sufferings, and which formed the great motto of his life, that no power could injure that man who did not wrong himself, did not abandon and betray his own highest interests.

• It appeared to the moral zeal of Chrysostom an object of the highest importance to deprive man of every ground of excuse for failing to put forth moral efforts. His fields of practical labour at Antioch and Constantinople encouraged and promoted in him this bent of mind; for in these great cities he found many who, in the weakness of human nature, in the power of Satan, or of fate, sought grounds of excuse for their deficiencies in practical Christianity.

These motives, from within and from without, had no small influence in giving direction to the development of Chrysostom's habit of thought, especially on these subjects; and with his peculiar style of homiletic composition, calculated upon, and adapted to, immediate practical needs, his mode of exhibiting his thoughts and views depended very much on the predominant interest which he was pursuing for the moment. His essential ideas are as follows:—

“The first man lived like the angels, in a state of undisturbed blessedness;—hence he could the more easily lose sight of his dependence on God. God gave him a precept, for the purpose of bringing him to a sense of his dependence. He fell by his own moral negligence. As he had rendered himself unworthy of the undisturbed enjoyment of happiness, he was expelled from paradise, for his own profit, that so he might train and discipline himself in conflict. His earlier state of communion with God, in a life exempt from pain and from care, was a type of the immortality to which he would have passed without a struggle. But now his body became mortal, and accessible to many temptations to sin.”* In explaining Romans v. 19, Chrysostom says: “This passage is not to be so understood, as if by the sin of one, all became sinners; but that the condition of human nature, which to the first man was a punishment, was thus transmitted to all his posterity. But this change redounds only to man's profit, if he is not wanting as it respects his own will. He derives therefrom many calls to despise things perishable, to strive after those that are heavenly,—many opportunities for the development and exercise of the virtues. The examples of the ancient heroes of the faith prove this.” And accordingly Chrysostom here takes occasion to express his favourite

* Antithesis between the *σῶμα θνητόν* and *παθητόν*, and the *σῶμα ἀπαθές*.

maxim,—if we but *will*, not only death, but even Satan himself shall never harm us.* The sinning of Adam under circumstances so well adapted to facilitate the practice of goodness, as contrasted with the good actions of others performed under hard conflicts, he often brought forward as an illustration of the truth so constantly present to his mind, that everything depends on man's will, and except through this, nothing from without, whether hurtful or helpful to him, can have any influence upon him.

Chrysostom was deeply penetrated with the feeling of the need of redemption, of the need of a fellowship of life with Christ. With great emphasis he announced the truth, which he found in the epistles of Paul, as well as in his own heart, that justification, by which he understood not merely forgiveness of sin, but also the communication of that more exalted dignity and worth which far transcended the powers of the limited finite nature, by means of the fellowship of life with Christ, was acquired, not by any merit or doing on the part of man, but by faith alone.† In the eighth homily on the first epistle to the Corinthians, § 4, he says,—“Christ is the head, we are the body. Can there be anything intervening between the head and the body? He is the vine, we are the branches. We are the temple, he is its inhabitant. He is the life, we are the living. He is the light, we are the enlightened. All this points to union, and leaves no room for the least intervening space. But he felt it to be important also; to set everywhere distinctly forth, that to believe or not to believe depends on man's self-determination; that there was no such thing as a constraining grace, not conditioned in its operations on the peculiar bent of man's own will; but that all grace is imparted according to the proportion of the will's determination. Here, too, he attached the most importance to the practical element—to counteract as well a proud self-confidence, as moral inactivity and self-neglect. God draws us to himself, not by force, but with our own free-will—says he, in the fifth homily on John, § 4, “Only shut not the door against the heavenly light, and thou shalt enjoy it abundantly.” “God comes not with his gifts before our

* H. 10, in ep. ad Rom. s. 3.

† See *e. g.* H. VII. et VIII. ep. ad Romanos.

will; but if we only begin, if we only will, he gives us many means of salvation.”*

Nestorius agreed in his views of human nature more nearly with Chrysostom than with Theodore.† During the same time that he was involved in the controversy on the doctrine concerning Christ's person, Julian and Cœlestus, with several other bishops of like mind, who had been deposed as Pelagians, came to Constantinople; and they had sought protection at the imperial court. They had also had recourse to the patriarch. Nestorius was not disposed, like his predecessor Atticus, to whom they had previously applied, to repel them at once, as men condemned by the highest ecclesiastical authorities of the West. Probably also the representations which they themselves made of their cause, were calculated to render him favourably disposed towards them, looking at the matter from the position of his own temperate Antiochian Anthropology. Before deciding either for or against them, he wrote to the Roman bishop Cœlestin, and requested of him a precise statement of the erroneous doctrines laid to their charge. He wrote twice without obtaining an answer, as perhaps the pride of the Roman bishop was hurt by the form of his interrogatory; and this it was which did so much injury to the cause of Nestorius in his relations with that prelate.‡ At this time, the Marius Mercator, so often mentioned by us, was residing at Constantinople. He was probably a layman from North Africa, who had some time before taken a lively part in the Pelagian controversy,§ and who was at the same

* Hom. 18 Joh. s. 3.

† As may be gathered from the extracts from his writings, and four of his sermons, which Marius Mercator has preserved in a Latin translation, and of which sermons the fourth still remains extant in the Greek original under the name of Chrysostom. See his works, ed. Montf. T. X. His violent enemy, Marius Mercator, acknowledges himself the Anti-Pelagian drift. It may be that these sermons were, as he supposes, preached in opposition to Pelagian opinions, on occasion of the controversy excited through the banished Pelagian bishops at Constantinople; but we are in nowise under the necessity of supposing this. Though there might be some reference of this sort, yet Nestorius probably had no design of combating the Pelagians, with whose doctrines he was so little acquainted; but rather to shield himself against the charges which his connection with those bishops had perhaps drawn upon him.

‡ See above.

§ See Augustin's reply to a letter of his of the year 418, ep. 163, among the letters of Augustin.

time full of suspicion as to the orthodoxy of the new patriarch, and one of his first zealous antagonists. He was led by these transactions to distribute at court among the bishops and nobles a memorial on the Pelagian matter, which memorial had for its consequence, probably, at a later period, when the authority of Nestorius was on the decline, the expulsion of these refugees. The combination into which the Roman bishop entered with the enemies of Nestorius might perhaps render the latter more favourably disposed to those individuals who had met with persecution from the same quarter. He wrote to Cœlestius a letter of condolence,* exhorting him, as a persecuted witness of the truth, to a steadfast confession, and inspiring him with the hope that the storms which then agitated the church, would also bring about a new investigation redounding to his own advantage. Nestorius was, indeed, at the outset, expecting good would result from the council that was to assemble at Ephesus.

These incidents were the occasion which led the Cyrillian party of the council of Ephesus, out of homage to the authority of the Roman bishop, to condemn at the same time with Nestorius the two leaders, Pelagius and Cœlestius, and their adherents, respecting whom and their doctrines they doubtless knew little or nothing, and about whom they otherwise gave themselves little concern. But neither did the Orientals wish by any means to be considered as Pelagians. On the contrary, their delegates at Constantinople sought to make the party of Cyril suspected by the Western agents as men who had received to their fellowship† heretics, Euchites, who taught the same doctrines as Pelagius and Cœlestius.‡

It continued still to be the prevailing tendency of the doctrine taught in the Greek church, to preserve the medium between two extremes, without entering into any very precise

* Marius Mercator has translated it. See his works, fol. 71.

† They knew perhaps but little about these latter; they had doubtless only heard, that these men taught believers might attain to perfect holiness, and hence were led to compare the Euchites with them.

‡ Τὰ αὐτὰ φηροῦντας Κελιστίῳ καὶ Πελαγίῳ, Εὐχῖται γὰρ εἰσιν ἄγουν Ἐνθουσιασταί. It was by no means Pelagians, then, who were meant, but Euchites; described, however, as holding the same tenets with Pelagius, in order to represent them, by a name better known in the West, as heretics. See the letter of the delegates to bishop Rufus, ep. 170, among the letters of Theodoret. T. IV. ed. Halen. p. 1352.

determinations of the relation between free-will and grace. For the sake of illustration, we will here take another example, and bring under one view the doctrines of a distinguished teacher of the Alexandrian church, the abbot Isidore of Pelusium. "By reason of the first sin, the nature of the first man became subject to the dominion of punishable things and to the excitements of sensual pleasure. As in this state he went on propagating his kind, the same condition was transmitted to his posterity, and the evil was still augmented among men through the negligence of each man's individual will.* There still remains, however, the seed of goodness† in human nature. They who fostered this, distinguished themselves; they who suppressed it, were punished. Even for that which proceeds from our own will, we need the assistance of divine grace; but this is never wanting to any who are only willing to do what belongs to themselves. There may, doubtless, in particular cases, be such a thing as prevenient grace, although, according to the general rule, grace is not prevenient—but there is no such thing as a constraining, irresistible grace. The assistance of grace is not such as that it may not be forfeited and lost by man's own fault; not such as is bestowed without any efforts of his own. The grace which awakens even those that are asleep, and impels even the not willing, will assuredly not forsake those who choose the good of their own accord. The words of our Lord—'All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given,' Matth. xix. 11, are in nowise to be so understood as if the better part were bestowed on many by arbitrary determination;‡ for in that case the kingdom of heaven would not be the reward of conflict."§

D.—*Doctrine of the Sacraments.*

The history of the doctrine concerning the church, especially among the Latins, we have already unfolded sufficiently at large in the first section. In the Greek church, it is true, the consequences flowing from the confounding together of the visible and the invisible church, of which we spoke in that

* Σῶμα θνητὸν καὶ παθητόν.

† Τὰ εἰς καλοκαγαλίαν σπέρματα.

‡ Ἀποκλήρωσις.

§ See I. III. ep. 204; I. II. ep. 2; III. 171; III. 13; III. 165.

section, were not in theory so systematically elaborated and carried out, and in individual instances, as in the case of Chrysostom and Isidore of Pelusium, there were gleams of a more spiritual apprehension of the notion of the church. Yet, on the whole, the practical church life was not less governed here than in the West by those principles growing out of the confusion of the visible and invisible church; with regard to the authority of an outward church, of tradition, of councils, and by the notions grounded thereupon respecting the nature and the effects of the sacraments.

The conception of the sacraments would, of course, be at first extremely vague; for there was not here, as in the case of other doctrines, a certain subject-matter, already given, in the sacred scriptures, and in the Christian consciousness, which needed but to be more fully developed; but in this case the general conception must first be formed from particulars, by the process of grasping together the common relations of these particulars to the Christian life and consciousness. In addition to this, there were no fixed and settled grounds on which to determine the choice of those objects to themselves, which were to be brought under this conception; and the difficulty was moreover increased by the ambiguity and vagueness of the term which had been invented without any definite consciousness of its meaning. The term sacramentum grew out of the translation of the Greek word *μυστήριον*; it was employed already in the preceding period, by a licence allowable in the Latin use of the word, to denote anything consecrated to a holy use, anything considered holy and sacred, and then applied sometimes to holy doctrines, sometimes to holy symbols. Already, in the preceding period, this designation had been applied particularly to baptism, to the holy supper, and to the rite of confirmation; but we remarked, in fact, already in the preceding period the existence of an inclination to multiply holy symbols in the church life. In this present period such a multiplication of symbols was promoted, especially in the Greek church, by the prevailing liturgical, and, in connection therewith, mystico-theurgical tendency;* as we see exemplified in the spurious writings of

* It is easy to see how mysticism, according to the different traits of individuals, may convert the objects of sense into symbols for the expression of its own feelings and intuitions, or even assume an attitude of hostility against all attempts to sensualize the spiritual and divine.

Dionysius the Areopagite, belonging to the fifth or sixth century. Augustin is entitled to the credit of having first introduced into this doctrine, in place of rhetorical exaggerations, a greater strictness of doctrinal phraseology; and by striving to seize it with clearer consciousness in its connection with the Christian spirit, of furnishing a counterpoise to the erroneous magico-theurgical tendency, which had come to attach itself to the apprehension of these doctrines.

Augustin describes the sacraments as being visible signs representing invisible, divine things, by means of which the divine matter is exhibited, as it were, by writing, by outward language. We have in his theory, therefore, the distinction between the invisible divine reality, the invisible divine power, the communication of the divine reality itself, and the sacrament as its outward representative symbol (the *res divinæ sanctæ*, the *virtutes sacramenti*, and the *sacramentum*). Without such outward symbols no religious society can subsist, whether growing out of a true or of a false religion. Hence, such symbols were no less necessary in Christianity than in Judaism. The one thing is the eternal and unchangeable reality; the other its changeable expression—just as words and written characters change, although that which they signify remains the same.*

It was therefore possible for God, without departing from his unchangeable counsels, to allow those external forms to change with the vicissitudes of time, to which they were successively adapted. This was urged by Augustin particularly against the Manichæans, inasmuch as they asserted that if the Old Testament institutions really proceeded from the same God as the New Testament, they could not have been annulled by him. The outward symbol has no power of conveying to man the divine reality, unless man's inward being is susceptible of communion with God—a position which followed from Augustin's doctrine concerning grace;—and here came in the opposition to the superstitious practices which grew out of the

* Quid enim sunt aliud quæque corporalia sacramenta, nisi quædam quasi verba visibilia, sacrosancta quidem, verumtamen mutabilia et temporalia?—In nullum nomen religionis, seu verum seu falsum, coagulari homines possunt, nisi aliquo signaculorum vel sacramentorum visibilium consortio colliguntur. Augustin c. Faustum, l. XIX. c. 11 et 12, and Tractat. 80, in Joannem. s. 3.

magical effects ascribed to the sacraments, on which side the influence of Augustin, for the promotion of vital Christianity, was felt in the succeeding centuries down to the time of the Jansenist controversies. Nor is the divine substance so necessarily connected with the outward signs that the grace of God cannot dispense with them.* But, in the usual order, the sacraments are the appointed means for the communication of the divine reality; and whosoever despises them excludes himself, by his contempt of the divine institution, from all participation in the divine reality itself. The sacrament, as a divine ordinance, retains its objective significance, independent of the subjective character of him who receives it, as of him who imparts it, though it redounds only to the condemnation of the individual who administers or receives it unworthily. This position Augustin was led to set forth distinctly in his controversy with the Donatists. In reference to baptism, he often compared it with the sign marked upon the soldiers as an emblem of the imperial service, which remained ineffaceable, and remained even with those who were unfaithful to the service; but, in that case, was only a testimony against them (the stigma militaris, character militaris, hence character indelebilis). Augustin regarded it as the peculiar mark of Christian freedom, as opposed to Jewish bondage, not only that Christianity, as the religion of the spirit, possessed but a few simple signs, easy to be observed, but also that in Christianity the sacraments were celebrated with the conscious knowledge of that which they imported, and hence with freedom; while in the Old Testament economy, on the other hand, they were celebrated with reverential fear and awe, without this accompanying consciousness; hence, the spirit was subservient to the outward symbols. The understanding of the sacrament is evinced in this, that it reveals to contemplation the love of God, and fires the heart with the love of God and of man. The prophets, who knew how to distinguish the sign from the divine thing signified, and revered in the former nothing

* Quomodo et Moses sanctificat et Dominus? Non enim Moses pro Domino, sed Moses visibilibus sacramentis per ministerium suum; Dominus autem invisibili gratia per Spiritum Sanctum, ubi est totus fructus etiam visibilium sacramentorum. But he pronounces it absurd to assert etiam istam invisibilem sanctificationem sine visibilibus sacramentis nihil prodesse. Quæstionum in Leviticum, l. III. quæst. 84.

but the latter, lived, therefore, already in the spirit of freedom.*

In respect to the number of sacraments, the way had, in fact, long since been prepared by the existing ideas relative to a particular priesthood, to the outward transmission of the Holy Spirit from the Apostles downwards by the imposition of hands, for apprehending the rite of ordination as holding equal rank with the other three sacraments.† The mystical and symbolizing spirit of the Pseudo-Dionysian writings led to the reception of two others besides the four sacraments above noticed; namely, consecration to the monastic life, and the ceremonials at the burial of the dead. Augustin, on the other hand, would be led by his correct views respecting the free spiritual worship of God as opposed to the slavish ceremonial religion in Judaism, to receive but few sacraments; as, in fact, where he speaks of this opposition, he names only baptism and the Lord's Supper,‡ with the additional clause, and anything besides these if it is recommended in the holy scriptures. Yet, the conception which he had opened out of the sacrament as a holy symbol was still not sufficiently precise to exclude the introduction of many other things; and what Augustin found already existing in the general usage of the church, he believed might be derived either from apostolic tradition, or the divine institution through general councils, and hence would adopt all such sacred usages and signs into his conception, along with the rest. Hence, he sided with the Western church, where the prevailing rule was to allow four sacraments, which, in other respects,

* *Posteaquam resurrectione Domini nostri manifestissimum iudicium nostræ libertatis illuxit, nec eorum quidem signorum operatione gravi onerati sumus; sed quædam pauca pro multis, eademque factu facillima et intellectu augustissima et observatione castissima ipse Dominus et apostolica tradidit disciplina.—Quæ unusquisque cum percipit quo referantur, imbutus agnoscit, ut ea non carnali servitute, sed spiritali potius libertate veneretur. De doctrina Christiana, l. III. s. 13. Nihil tam pie terret animum, quam sacramentum non intellectum; intellectum autem, gaudium pium parit et celebratur libere, si opus est temporis.—The right antithesis to the deification of the sacraments. Expositio epistolæ ad Galatos, c. 3, s. 19. Comp. ep. 54, ep. 55 and 138 ad Januarium.*

† Thus it is placed together with baptism and the Lord's supper, in Gregory of Nyssa, on the baptism of Christ. He who was before *εἰς τῶν πολλῶν, ἀοράτων* τινὶ δυνάμει καὶ χάριτι τὴν ψυχὴν μεταμορφωθείς πρὸς τὸ βελτίον.

‡ Ep. 118.

too, fell in with his ideas;* and, in maintaining against the Pelagians† that obedience to the natural instinct is sanctified by the religious and moral reference of the marriage union, he was led accordingly to reckon the solemnization of marriage among the sacraments, which, perhaps, might seem to him to be sanctioned by the use of the word *μυστήριον* in this reference in the epistle to the Ephesians;‡ and, at all events, the higher Christian conception of marriage lay at the basis of what is there said.

As it respects the doctrine concerning baptism, from which, for reasons stated under the preceding period, the doctrine of regeneration was not severed, we must observe that the difference here again became strongly marked, which we discern in the views of the Eastern compared with those of the Western church, with regard to human nature and the doctrine of redemption; namely, that in the Western church, with original sin, the negative effect of the redemption in procuring deliverance from this; and in the Eastern church, on the other hand, the positive effect of the redemption considered in the light of a new creation, were made especially prominent. Thus Gregory of Nazianzus§ calls baptism a more divine exalted creation than the original formation of nature.|| Thus, too, Cyrill of Jerusalem, addressing the candidate for baptism, says: "If thou believest, thou not only obtainest the forgiveness of sins, but thou effectest also that which is above man. Thou obtainest as much of grace as thou canst hold."¶ This difference would be strongly marked, especially in the case of infant baptism. According to the North-African scheme of doctrine, which taught that all men were from their birth, in consequence of the guilt and sin transmitted from Adam, subjected to the same condemnation, that they bore within them the principles of all sin, deliverance from original sin and inherited guilt would be made particularly prominent in the case of infant baptism, as in the case of the baptism of adults; and this was favoured by the ancient formula of baptism, which, however, originated in a

* See c. ep. Parmenian. l. II. c. 13.

† When these accused him of making marriage itself a sinful thing through his idea of the concupiscentia as springing out of sin,

‡ De nuptiis et concupiscentia, l. l. c. 17.

§ Orat. 40, de baptismo.

|| Πλάσις θείοις καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἐψηλότεια.

¶ Cateches. 17, c. 17, 18. Ποιῖς καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων.

period when infant baptism had as yet no existence, and had been afterwards applied, without alteration, to children, because men shrunk from undertaking to introduce any change in the consecrated formula established by apostolical authority, though Christians were by no means agreed as to the sense in which they applied this formula. Accordingly, says Gregory Nazianzen, to children baptism is a seal (a means of securing human nature in the germ against all moral evil by the higher principle of life communicated to it); for adults it is, moreover, forgiveness of sin and restoration of the image degraded and lost by transgression.* Hence, he looks upon infant baptism as a consecration to the priestly dignity, which is imparted to the child from the beginning, that so evil may gain no advantage over him.† In a homily addressed to the neophytes Chrysostom specifies ten different effects of grace wrought in baptism; and then he complains of those who make the grace of baptism consist simply in the forgiveness of sin.‡ True, the difference here becomes manifest between the more rhetorical Chrysostom and the systematic Augustin; for the latter would have referred those ten specifications to one fundamental conception, in which they might all be summed up together. But at the basis of this difference lay that other, which has already been noticed, in respect to the general mode of Christian intuition. Hence Chrysostom adds: It is for this reason we baptize also infants, though they are not, like others, stained with sin, that so holiness, justification, adoption, heirship, and brothership with Christ may be imparted to them through Christ, that so they may be members of Christ.§

These words of Chrysostom are, indeed, known to us only in the Latin translation, and through a citation of the Pelagian writer Julian.|| But their genuineness is evinced by the fact that Augustin had nothing to object to them on that score,

* Τοῖς μὲν ἀρχόμενοις σφραγίς, τοῖς τελειότεροις τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ χάρισμα καὶ πεισούσης εἰκονος διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἐπανόρθωσις. Orat. 40, f. 640.

† Μὴ λαβέτω καὶρὸν ἢ κακία ἐκ βερίφους ἀγιασθήτω. L. c. 648.

‡ Vides quot sunt baptismatis largitates; et nonnulli deputant, coelestem gratiam in peccatorum tantum remissione consistere; nos autem honores computavimus decem.

§ Hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coinquinati peccato, ut eis addatur sanctitas, justitia, adoptio, hæreditas, fraternitas Christi, ut ejus membra sint.

|| Vid. Augustin. c. Julianum, l. I. s. 21.

but must seek to deprive Pelagianism of this support by giving the passage another interpretation. And, in truth, this passage strictly accords with the peculiar character already noticed, belonging to the type of doctrine not only of the Oriental church generally, but of Chrysostom in particular. Julian was wrong in explaining the words of Chrysostom wholly according to his own sense, as if Chrysostom had meant to say that human nature is still born in the same state as it was at first; for this is, in fact, at variance with his doctrine concerning the innocence (*ἀπαθεία*) lost by the sin of the first man (see above). But if Julian was wrong in this single respect, that he contemplated the words wholly out of their connection with Chrysostom's entire mode of thinking on doctrinal matters, Augustin, on the other hand, manifestly tortured them, when he explained them according to *his* system, as referring barely to the absence of actual, personal sin; for in this case, the antithesis made by Chrysostom would, in fact, not hold good.

Isidore of Pelusium also replies to the question, why infants, who are without sin, should be baptised,* in the following way. Some, who took too narrow a view of the matter,† said it was that they might be cleansed from the sin transmitted to them from Adam. This, indeed, he said, was not to be denied, but it was not the only reason. This would still be a thing not so great after all; but there would be besides many other gracious gifts communicated to them, which far exceed any possible attainments of human nature. Infants were not only delivered from the punishment of sin, but, moreover, had imparted to them a divine regeneration, adoption, justification,‡ fellowship with Christ. The remedy amounted to far more than the mere removal of an evil.§

Theodore of Mopsuestia seized in this case upon only one side or moment of the Oriental church doctrine, which moment, in infant baptism, was ever made the more prominent one; but the other he dropped entirely, as his system required that he should. It is, according to his doctrine, the same state of

* Ep. v. 195.

† Σμικρολογούντες.

‡ Δικαίωσις, here used, beyond doubt, in the sense of Augustin, viz. the making just, making holy by union with Christ.

§ Νο φαρμακὸν ἀντίρροπον τοῦ τραύματος.

human nature, mutable and liable to temptation, in which the first man was created (see p. 414) and in which all infants are born.* Baptism in the case of adults has a two-fold purpose, to bestow on them the forgiveness of sin, and to exalt them by fellowship with Christ to a participation in his freedom from sin, and his moral immutability, which is the passing over from the first portion of the development of life in humanity, into the second, which is fully entered upon only at the general restoration (see page 417). That which is received at baptism is the principle and pledge of that freedom from sin (*anamar-tesia*) which will then first come to be fully realized. In the case of infant baptism, then, the forgiveness of sin, according to Theodore's doctrine, does not properly come into consideration; but its purpose and object is simply the imparting of that new and higher life, exempt from sin, of which the entire human nature stands in need. He distinguishes, accordingly, a two-fold meaning of the forgiveness of sin, to the bestowment of which the formula of baptism refers.* He supposed, therefore, in this latter respect, the same supernatural communication in the case of infant baptism as in the case of the baptism of adults: though, following out the natural bent of his acute and discriminating understanding, he carefully distinguished here, too, that which is merely the symbol and vehicle, from that which is the working principle, lest that should be ascribed to the magical operation of the water, which could only be ascribed to the agency of the Holy Spirit.† The water, he maintained, according to the comparison employed by Christ

* So Theodore, in his address to the neophytes: *Renatus, alter factus es pro altero, non jam pars Adam, mutabilis et peccatis circumfusi; sed Christi, qui omnino inculpabilis per resurrectionem factus est.* Act. IV. Concil. œcumen. V. c. 36. Δύο ἀφίσεις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν μὲν τῶν πεπραγμένων, τὴν δὲ τὴν ἀναμαρτησίαν, ἀφίσειν ἁμαρτιῶν τελίαν καὶ κυριώτατην καὶ ἀναίρεσιν ἁμαρτίας παντελῆ. (The ambiguity which is attached to the Greek word *ἀφίσις* by its etymology here came to his assistance.) Ἡξάτο μὲν ἐμφανίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸν δεσπότην Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας καὶ ἐν ἀρραβῶνος ἡμῶν δίδοσθαι τάξει. Δίδοται δὲ τελείως καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔργοις καὶ ἐν τῇ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀποκατάστασι, ὥστε ἥς ἵνα τύχωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ τὰ βεῖφη βαπτιζόμεθα.

† The water τὸ ἐν ᾧ πληροῦται τὸ ἔργον; the πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τὴν οὐκείαν πληροῦν ἐνεργίαν τούτου γὰρ ἵνεκα καὶ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα μετὰ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν, τοῦδε ὕδατος οὐ μεμνήμεθα, ὥς φαίνοσθαι, ὅτι τὸ μὲν σύμβολον καὶ χρεῖας τινος ἵνεκιν παραλαμβάνεται, τὸ δὲ ὥς ἐνεργὸν ἐπικαλούμεθα.

in his conversation with Nicodemus, stood related to the creative power of God in the new and higher birth, as the body of the mother to the creative power of God in the natural birth.*

This mode of apprehension was adopted, as we learn particularly from the explanations of Cœlestius and of Julian, by the Pelagians; though it did not in their system rest upon the same foundation as in the Oriental and in the Antiochian systems. In this way we must understand what Cœlestius says in the creed which he sent to Rome: "Infants must, according to the rule of the universal church, and according to the declaration of the Gospel, be baptized in order to the forgiveness of sin. Since our Lord has determined that the kingdom of heaven can be bestowed only on the baptized, and since the powers of nature are not adequate to this, it must be the free gift of grace."† It is clear that Cœlestius, in denying that any sinfulness adhered to infants, could understand baptism for the forgiveness of sins in this case only after the same manner with Theodore of Mopsuestia; and, accordingly, he understood also, in like manner with the latter, by the kingdom of heaven, that which transcends the limits of human nature, that which can only be bestowed upon it by a higher communication from God. Thus the Pelagian Julian, though he absolutely denied the possibility of any forgiveness of sins in the case of infants, could still declare that baptism, having been once instituted by Christ, must be acknowledged as universally valid and necessary for every age; that eternal condemnation awaited every one who denied that this rite was profitable also for children.‡

The grace of baptism, said he, is everywhere the same; but its effects appear different, according to the different relations and circumstances of the subjects of it. In some, the negative effect, the forgiveness of sin, must precede the positive, the

* "Ὅσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς φυσικῆς γεννήσεως ἡ κοιλία τὸ φυσικὸν ἐργαστήριον ἐστίν, ἐν ᾧ τὸ σικτόμενον ἀποτελεῖται θεία δυνάμει, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ ὕδωρ ἐν τῷ μέρει τῆς μητρὸς λαμβάνεται, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐν τάξει τοῦ διαπλάττοντος θεοῦ." *De peccato originis*, c. v.

† Augustin. *De peccato originis*, c. v.

‡ Nos gratiam Christi, id est baptismum ex quo ritum ejus Christus instituit, ita necessariam omnibus in commune ætatibus confiteri, ut quicumque eam utilem etiam parvulis negat, æterno feriamus anathemate. *Opus imperfectum c. Juliani*, l. III. c. 149.

exaltation of man's nature. In infants the effect is only to *ennoble* the nature which remains in its original condition of goodness."* Although it would be natural for the Pelagians, according to the principles of their system, to ascribe to baptism, as being an external act, a merely symbolical import, yet they did not find it possible to disentangle themselves wholly from the church tradition of their period; but they sought to reconcile what they found in that tradition, as they best could, with their own principles, which had arisen in an entirely different way. Moreover, with regard to the relations of the divine matter to the external sign, of regeneration to outward baptism, they had precisely the same notions which were the prevailing ones in the church; for this becomes sufficiently clear from what they taught respecting the effects of infant baptism; and Julian expressed himself on this point with distinctness and precision.†

On the one hand, the doctrine which, ever since the time of Cyprian, by the habit of confounding the inward grace with its outward sign in baptism, had become predominant, especially in the North-African church, the doctrine of the damnation of unbaptized infants, appeared to the Pelagians as something revolting, something whereby a tyrannical arbitrary will was imputed to the divine Being. But, on the other hand, they must themselves, however, according to the theory just unfolded, suppose the higher grace of participating in the highest stage of blessedness in the kingdom of heaven was conditioned solely on the obtaining of baptism; and even *they* found this asserted in the words of Christ to Nicodemus, as even *they* made no distinction of the baptism of the Spirit from the baptism with water. Accordingly they must of necessity affirm, with regard to unbaptized infants, that although free and exempt from punishment, they were still excluded from that higher state of being, and attained only to a certain intermediate state. This

* L. c. s. 151. Quæ tamen gratia, quoniam etiam medicina dicitur, facit alios ex malis bonos; parvulos autem, quos creat condendo bonos, reddit innovando adoptandoque meliores. Æqualiter cunctis a se imbutis adoptionis et sanctificationis et promotionis dona conferre. L. c. l. II. c. 116.

† When he says of baptismal grace: Infusa semel uno virtutis suæ impetu atque compendio diversa et plurima delet crimina. Opus imperfectum, l. II. c. 212.

was what Cœlestius really meant to say in the declarations above cited.

And to the same result on this subject must every one have been led, who was inclined to adopt the Oriental mode of considering the effects of baptism, and would consistently follow out the matter to a definite conclusion; unless he supposed a universal redemption or restoration as the final end, to which that intermediate state was destined to prove a point of transition for unbaptized infants. Such an intermediate state Gregory Nazianzen also assigned for those who were unbaptized through no fault of their own.* Augustin himself had once entertained a like opinion.† Ambrose of Milan‡ believed, also, that it was necessary to infer from the words of Christ to Nicodemus, that none could enter into the kingdom of heaven without baptism; but it was his opinion, though he had no confidence in it, that unbaptized infants would be exempted from punishment. Pelagius himself shrunk from expressing any decided opinion on this point, though by logical thinking it was absolutely out of his power to avoid that consequence of his principles. He affirmed of unbaptized children, that of one thing he was sure, namely, that they could not, as innocent beings, suffer punishment consistently with the divine justice; but what would become of them, was more than he knew, doubtless because he was of the opinion that no distinct declaration on this point could be found in the sacred scriptures.§

But then Augustin could, however, not without good reason, accuse the Pelagians of inconsistency, when they charged the advocates of the doctrine of absolute predestination with imputing arbitrary will to God, while they themselves were still more involved in this error, by supposing that God excluded innocent beings from the kingdom of heaven, which he bestowed on others who were in no respect more worthy of it. The notion, moreover, of an intermediate place between the state of woe and the kingdom of heaven, was a thing altogether unscriptural and incredible in itself: for man, being in the

* Orat. 40.

† Sect. I. III. de libero arbitrio, c. 23.

‡ De Abrahamo, l. II. s. 84.

§ Quo non eant, scio, quo eant, nescio. And perhaps he meant the same thing by his words in the letter to Innocent, bishop of Rome: in perpetuam certamque vitam renasci eum, qui natus sit ad incertam.

image of God, was destined to find his bliss in communion with God, and out of that communion could be no otherwise than wretched.* The Council of Carthage, A.D. 418, finally condemned, in its II. Canon, the doctrine concerning such an intermediate state for unbaptized children, on the ground, that nothing could be conceived as existing between the kingdom of God and perdition; but then, too, according to the doctrine of this council, the eternal perdition of all unbaptized infants was expressly affirmed—a consistency of error revolting to the natural sentiments of humanity. It is worthy of notice, however, that this particular passage of the canon is wanting in a portion of the manuscripts.

But such being the prevailing doctrine concerning baptism, reflecting minds must now have been struck with the difficulty of conceiving how a divine influence could take effect in the case of infants devoid of all conscious moral action of their own. Augustin, by means of his correct principles, above explained, respecting the essence of sacraments, might have found out a better way, if he had not been fettered by the authority of the church doctrine. His reply, indeed, explains nothing; but it proceeds from a profound feeling of the essential nature of Christian fellowship. He says: The faith of the church, which consecrates infants to God in the spirit of love, takes the place of their own faith; and albeit they possess as yet no faith of their own, yet there is nothing in their thoughts to hinder the divine efficacy.”† His scheme, then, amounted to this: that as the child, ere its corporeal and independent existence was fully developed, was supported by the vital forces of nature in its bodily mother, so, ere it came to the independent development of its spiritual being in its own consciousness, it is supported by the heightened vital forces of that spiritual mother, the church—an idea, which would involve some truth, supposing the visible church corresponded to its ideal, when applied, without being so literally understood, to infant baptism.

With regard to the doctrine of the holy supper, we find in

* Augustinus: Nunquam explicant isti, qua justitia nullum peccatum habens imago Dei separetur a regno Dei. De peccatorum meritis et remissione, l. I. c. 30. Hoc novum in ecclesia, prius inauditum est, esse vitam æternam præter regnum cœlorum, esse salutem æternam præter regnum Dei. Sermo 294.

† Nullus obex contrariæ cogitationis, ep. 23, ad Bonifacium.

this period almost precisely the same gradations in the notions respecting the relations of the external signs to the things signified, as in the period preceding. In this period, too, the idea chiefly predominant was that of a supernatural communion, in part spiritual and in part corporeal, with Christ, by means of the intimate interpenetration of the bread and wine by the body and blood of Christ. As in the former period this view was most distinctly expressed by Irenæus and Justin Martyr, so in the present it was most strongly asserted by Cyrill of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Nilus, Hilary of Poitiers, and Ambrose of Milan. Thus Cyrill of Jerusalem declares it to be the purpose of the sacrament of the supper, that we should take within us the body and blood of Christ, Christ himself;* that by the body and blood of Christ passing over into our members, we may become partakers of the divine nature, be sanctified in body and soul.† Chrysostom says that we may be not only united with our Saviour by love, but in our entire nature blended with his body.‡ He contemplates the institution of the eucharist as a proof of the greatest love of our Saviour to men, of his will to be united to them, and to impart himself to them in the most intimate manner, to cause his own body to pass over into their entire nature. He gave himself not only to be seen, but also to be touched and to be partaken of by those who desire him.§ So Hilary of Poitiers affirms that between Christ and believers there exists not only a unity of will, but a natural union, (not only per concordiam voluntatis, but also per naturæ veritatem,) partly because Christ assumed human nature, and partly because in the eucharist he gives his body, and thereby his divine life residing therein to believers.||

True, these church-teachers sometimes have recourse to

* Σύσσωμοι καὶ σύναιμοι Χριστοῦ, χριστόφοροι.

† Cateches. myst. 4.

‡ Εἰς ἐκείνην ἀνακερυσθῶμεν τὴν σὰρκα κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρῶγμα.

§ Hom. 46 in Joann.

|| Hilarius de trinitate, l. VIII. s. 13. Quomodo non naturaliter in nobis existimandus est, qui et naturam carnis nostræ jam inseparabilem sibi homo natus assumpsit, et naturam carnis suæ ad naturam æternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit. He would impart to us the natura æternitatis, his own divine essence, in imparting to us his body in the sacramental form—the same that Irenæus called ἰνωσις πρὸς αἰφρασίαν.

figures, for the purpose of describing the efficacy of the consecration at the Lord's supper, which seem to indicate a proper transubstantiation, like the change of the water to wine at the marriage feast at Cana;* and they employ expressions which *might* denote transubstantiation.† But these terms were also frequently employed to indicate another change to something more exalted, not precisely a transubstantiation; and especially, in the rhetorical light of church-teachers, who would fain set forth in strong language the wonderful nature of the transaction, such expressions should not be too rigidly interpreted. Even in the case of these comparisons, everything turns upon the point to be illustrated, namely, that by a miracle the substance present becomes something other than it was before, no matter in what particular sense this is to be understood. These comparisons are counterbalanced by others, which totally contradict the notion of transubstantiation; as, for instance, the comparison with the anointing oil used in confirmation, or with the higher consecration bestowed on the water in baptism.‡ The disputes concerning the two natures in Christ gave the first occasion for entering into a more distinct exposition of the conceptions respecting the relation of the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ; for those who affirm the union of two natures unchangeably persisting in their essence sought to make this clear by introducing the comparison of the Lord's supper. As the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, says Theodoret, remain in their original substance and form, admit of being seen and felt as precisely the same as they were before, but the contemplation of the spirit and of faith sees in them that which they have become; and they are also adored § as that which they are to faith. ||

* See Cyrill. Cateches. 22. Ambros. de mysteriis, c. 9.

† As, for example, μεταποιῶν, Cyrill. Cateches. 23, transfiguratio in corpus et sanguinem. Ambros. de incarnationis dominicæ sacramento, l. I. c. iv. s. 23, de fide, l. IV. c. x. s. 124.

‡ See Cyrill. Cateches. 21, s. 3.

§ See vol. ii. and Ambros. de Spiritu Sancto, l. III. c. xi. s. 79, caro Christi, quæ in mysteriis adoratur.

|| Theodoret, in the second dialogue of his Ἐρωσιστης: Μίνι ἐπὶ τῆς προτίρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἶδους καὶ ὁρατὰ ἔστι καὶ ἀπτά, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν, νοεῖται δὲ ἅπασιν ἐγίνετο καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἱκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπασιν πιστεύεται. Ed. Hal. T. IV. p. 126. Thus, too, the μεταβολὴ τῇ χάριτι is opposed to the μεταβολὴ τῆς φύσεως. Dialog. I. T. V. p. 26. The first unfolding of views of this sort would be found in

Even Gelasius, a *Roman bishop*, towards the close of the fifth century, explained his views after the same manner.*

Gregory of Nyssa might in this respect undoubtedly constitute an exception. While aiming in his catechetical disquisition, (λόγος κατηχητικός) c. 37, to explain the way in which bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ, and particularly to solve the difficulty, how the body of Christ, being one, is distributed among so many thousand believers in the world, and still remains one and the same and complete, he is led to an exposition which seems to presuppose a transubstantiation, and which, moreover, was seized upon by the later theory of the transformation of the bread among the Greeks. It was this—that in like manner as, during the life of Jesus on earth, the natural means of nourishment, bread and wine, were transmuted into the essence of the body united with the deity, through the power of the divine Logos, but *mediately* by that natural process whereby the means of nourishment are converted into flesh and blood; so, at present, the same effect is produced, bread and wine is converted into the body of the Logos, by the same power of the Logos, only working at present in the way of an immediate miracle. Yet *he*, also, was still certainly very far from holding fast, with clear consciousness, the idea which seemed to be here lying at bottom; for in his sermon on the baptism of Christ,† he makes use of comparisons which are grounded on a totally different idea, as, for instance, the heightened efficacy of the consecration of the baptismal water, of the anointing oil, of ordination. It is also deserving of remark, how little in the case of this theologian,‡ in other respects so systematic, these particular doctrines were carried out in coherence with his

Chrysostom, if the fragment of a letter of his to the monk Cæsarius, which must have been aimed against the Apollinarists, were really genuine. But this letter was most probably interpolated on occasion of the controversy concerning the two natures. Yet a comparison which Nilus, the disciple of Chrysostom, employs, indicates the same mode of apprehension; as a document, after having been signed by the emperor, is called a *sacra*, so ordinary bread and wine, after the consecration and inward working of the Holy Spirit, is called the body and blood of Christ. Lib. I. ep. 44.

* De duabus naturis in Christo, adversus Eutychem et Nestorium, in the Bibl. patr. Lugd. T. VIII.: In divinam transeunt, Spiritu Sancto perficiente, substantiam, permanente tamen in sua proprietate natura.

† T. III. f. 370.

‡ Ep. iv. ad Serapionem.

peculiar principles; for his ideas concerning the character of Christ's glorified body (see above, vol. iv. p. 97), would have easily led him to dispose of the difficulty above noticed by him in an altogether different way; but that idea of the repetition of the incarnation of the Logos which had taken possession of his mind, did not leave room for him here to think of Christ's *glorified body*.

The idea of a union with Christ presents itself already, under a form in which it appears to be less sensuously apprehended, in the writings of Athanasius. From John vi. 62, he endeavours to show that according to that passage the partaking of the flesh and of the blood of Christ was not to be understood in the literal sense. Christ, he says, mentions on this occasion his ascension to heaven *for the very purpose* of turning away men's minds from sensuous notions, and leading them to the idea of a spiritual nourishment; * inasmuch as Christ communicates himself to each after a spiritual manner.† The addition, "as the preservative to a blessed resurrection,"‡ shows that he also conceived of a higher principle of life being communicated to the body, by means of the contact with Christ.

The doctrine of the North-African church, as we have already described it in the preceding period, we once more meet with in Augustin. He explains the words of institution as follows:—that Christ's body was the same thing as the symbol of his body.§ He says that the expression, to give his body and flesh to eat, contains a bold figure, and that the sense which lies at bottom must be expounded according to the analogy of faith.|| According to the analogy of the religious use of language, by virtue of which the sacramental sign is substituted for the thing itself, in the same way, for example, as the sacramentum fidei is substituted for faith itself in the case of children who are as yet incapable of faith, according to

* The term πνευματικόν is not restricted, indeed, to the meaning "spiritual," but may also denote supernatural as opposed to natural, sensible nourishment.

† Πνευματικῶς ἀναδίδωσθαι.

‡ Φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς.

§ Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere: hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui. In the like connection as when he says "Petra erat Christus" is equivalent to significabat Christum. C. Adimantum, c. 12.

|| Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum, l. II. c. 9.

this analogy the symbol of Christ's body is put for the body itself.* But although Augustin, in the case of the eucharist, as everywhere else, considered the consecrated outward elements as symbols merely, clearly separating and holding apart the sacramentum and the *res sacramenti*, yet he at the same time supposed, as in the case of the sacraments generally so in the case of the eucharist in particular, a divine matter united with the holy symbols, and which is communicated to the believing heart. The *res sacramenti* is the uniting of the faithful as members with their One great Head, and the fellowship grounded therein of the faithful with each other, as members of one body; therefore their union into one community of the saints.† By the body of Christ in the eucharist Augustin understands the spiritual body of the members united with Christ as the head. To the question how Christ, who died and rose again, sits at the right hand of God, and will come again to judgment, can here distribute his body—to this question he gives an entirely different answer from that of Gregory of Nyssa. According to his spiritual mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Lord's supper, there could be no difficulty on this point. By pointing to the spiritual sense as the only correct one, he had at once answered the question. On this very account was the transaction called a sacrament, because one thing is presented to the eye of sense, and another thing discerned by the eye of the spirit.‡ Hence Christ said to the Jews when he should be seen to ascend up where he was before, then they would be obliged to understand that he could only have spoken of a spiritual communication, of a fellowship of divine life.§ The flesh profiteth nothing—that is, without the spirit. The flesh was only the vessel through which the spirit wrought, through which Christ communicated himself to us.|| Christ is eternal life, and in his flesh and blood gives himself. Augus-

* See l. III. de trinitate, c. x. s. 19 et 20, ep. 98.

† Hunc cibum et potum vult intelligi societatem corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta ecclesia.—Corpus Christi si vis intelligere, apostolum audi dicentem fidelibus: vos autem estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa dominica positum est, mysterium vestrum accipitis.

‡ Ideo dicuntur sacramenta, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur.

§ Certe vel tunc intelligetis, quia gratia ejus non consumitur morsibus.

|| Si caro nihil non prodesset, verbum caro non fieret, ut inhabitaret in nobis. Caro vas fuit; quod habebat, attende, non quod erat.

tin distinguishes the inward and the outward manducation of the supper (*manducare intus et foris*). The former is the privilege only of believers ;* but the unbelieving and the unworthy receive nothing but the *sacrament* of the body and blood of Christ.†

Next we find a more spiritual apprehension of this doctrine in those church-teachers on whose theological education the study of Origen had exerted a decided influence ; from which number, however, it is evident, from what has been said, Gregory of Nyssa† must be excepted, although on other subjects he accords very nearly with Origen. Gregory Nazianzen calls the eucharist an archetype of the great mystery of the sacrifice of Christ ;§ the symbol of the sacrifice by which the salvation of mankind had been wrought out.|| Assuredly, however, he conceived in connection with this a higher divine influence, as is sufficiently evident from looking at the connection of his ideas relative to the priesthood, and to sacrifice ; and this is confirmed, moreover, by certain individual expressions of his concerning the effects of the eucharist, as when he calls it a sacrifice, by which we enter into fellowship with Christ, into fellowship with his sufferings and his divine nature,¶—the holy transaction which exalts us to heaven.** He accordingly supposes a certain sanctifying influence of the Logos, which, by virtue of the words pronounced by the priest, becomes united with the symbols of the bread and wine ; and in so far then as the outward symbols, as vehicles of this super-

* *Habe fidem, et tecum est quem non vides.*

† Sermo 235, 272. Tractat. 26, Evang. Joh.

‡ At the same time, however, this mode of apprehension does not appear, with him, to be an entirely isolated thing, but stands strictly connected with his whole system ; for in this is made distinctly prominent the fundamental idea, that as the principle of corruption (*φθόρα*) was propagated in human nature from the first sin ; so, in opposition to this, the principle of incorruption (*ἀφθαρσία*), proceeding from Christ, must pervade the entire human nature as the first fruits (*ἀπαρχή*) of the new creation. Yet another modification of this idea might, indeed, have offered itself to him, corresponding to that notion of the character of Christ's glorified body, explained above on page 97.

§ Orat. i. f. 38. *Τῶν μεγάλων μυστηρίων ἀντιτυπον.*

|| *Τύποι τῆς ἰυῆς σωτηρίας.* Orat. xvii. f. 273.

¶ Orat. iii. f. 70. *Δι' ἧς ἡμῖς Χριστῷ κοινωνοῦμεν, καὶ τῶν παθημάτων καὶ τῆς Θεότητος.*

** *Ἄνω φέρουσα μυσταγωγία.* Orat. xvii. f. 273.

natural sanctifying impartation of the Logos, are substituted in place of the real body of Christ, they are called the body and blood of Christ.* Eusebius of Cæsarea probably distinguishes, like his teacher Origen,† the sensible and the spiritual eucharist. In reference to the former he says: it is enjoined upon Christians to celebrate the remembrance of Christ's sacrifice by the symbols of his body and blood.‡ In reference to the latter he thus paraphrases the words of Christ in the 6th chapter of John's gospel: "Think not that I am speaking of the body which I bear with me, as if this must be eaten. Neither think that I bid you drink my sensible and bodily blood; but know that the very words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life, so that my words and doctrines themselves are my flesh and blood. He who, by appropriating to himself these becomes, so to speak, nourished with the bread from heaven, will be made a partaker of the heavenly life."§

E.—*Doctrine of the last things.*

In respect to the doctrine concerning the last things it is to be observed that the notions respecting disciplinary or purgatory sufferings, which in the East and West had already in the preceding period shaped themselves out into different forms from a commixture of Persico-Jewish and Christian ideas, passed over into this period also. It was supposed that the doctrine of a purgatorial fire was to be found in Malachi iii., and in 1 Corinthians iii. 12.¶ In connection with the notion of a dead faith, and the confounding together of the conceptions of the visible and of the invisible church, this doctrine, as had happened before, under a Jewish-Christian mode of apprehension, that

* See ep. 240, ad Amphilochem, among the few letters which are inserted at the beginning of the first volume of his works: "Ὅταν λόγῳ καθέλληης τὸν λόγον ὅταν ἀναμάκτω τομῇ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τέμνης δισποτινὸν, φωνῇ ἔχων τὸ ξίφος. These words, no doubt, admit of being understood, according to the mode of apprehension already noticed, as referring to a repeated incarnation (ἐνσάρκωσις): but we must consider too, that Gregory was much addicted to rhetorical exaggeration.

† See vol. II. p. 393.

‡ Demonstrat. evangel. lib. I. c. 10. f. 39.

§ Theol. eccles. l. III. c. 12.

¶ Vid. Cyrill. cateches. 15, s. 9: Πῶς δοκιμαστικὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων before the last judgment. Pænæ quædam purgatoriae. De civitate Dei, l. XX. c. 25; l. XXI. c. 13, 24.

for example of the Clementines, was abused in being made the foundation of the false view, that whoever was a member of the orthodox Catholic church, and at the same time led a vicious life, would possess this advantage over the unbelieving, that although he needed to pass through such a purification after death, he would still in the end attain to salvation. Thus the passage, just mentioned, in the first epistle to the Corinthians was so misconstrued that it was supposed it might be affirmed of him who united with the pretended faith in Christ every species of vice, that he built on the foundation, which is Christ. The moral zeal of Pelagius against an error so practically mischievous led him to contend against the doctrine of such an *ignis purgatorius*, as may be gathered from his declaration which he made at the synod of Diospolis.* Augustin sought to guard this doctrine against such misinterpretations.† He considered that passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians as referring immediately to the purification by means of trials in the present life of those who, though inspired by love to Christ, were still not as yet so penetrated by it as to have their hearts entirely cleansed from the love of earthly things; for, in order that Christ should really be the foundation, it was required that the love to him should over-balance all other interests, and that the soul should be ready to sacrifice everything for him.‡ Such a proof of purification continuing to go on even after death, but only in the case of those who, in the sense just described, had made Christ the basis of their life, he considered to be a supposable thing; so that many believers attained to the state of blessedness through a certain purifying fire, enduring for a longer or shorter time, according as they had set their affections more or less on perishable goods. But he puts down this doctrine as somewhat doubtful.§

The doctrine of eternal punishment continued, as in the preceding period, to be dominant in the creed of the church. Yet, in the Oriental church, in which, with the exception of those

* See above, p. 308, Note. † In his *enchiridion ad Laurentium*, c. 68.

‡ Si Christus in corde fundamenti habet locum, id est, ut ei nihil antepōnatur, et malit homo qui tali dolore uritur, rebus quas ita diligit, magis carere quam Christo, per ignem fit salvus. Si autem res hujus modi temporales ac seculares tempore tentationis maluerit tenere quam Christum, eum in fundamento non habuit cum in ædificio prius non sit aliquid fundamento.

§ Incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit, quæri potest.

subjects immediately connected with the doctrinal controversies, there was greater freedom, and latitude of development, many respectable church-teachers still stood forth, without injuring their reputation for orthodoxy, as advocates of the opposite doctrine, until the time when the Origenistic disputes caused the agreement with Origen in respect to this point also to be considered as something decidedly heretical. The scepticism with regard to that doctrine arose from very different points of view, and very different interests. For the most part, in the great cities of the East, it arose by no means from a more free and earnest reflection on religious subjects, but from a lack of Christian seriousness, and a superficial and trifling mode of judgment. There were persons who could not seize the contrariety of moral evil to God's holiness in its strict truth, entangled as they still were too much in the pagan view of evil as a property of nature, and hence were still too far from rightly understanding the true essence of Christian sanctification. They would fain reason away the doctrine of eternal punishment, simply because this doctrine presented terrifying images, which disturbed them in a life too deficient in point of moral strictness and purity. God, they imagined, could not so severely judge the weaknesses of mankind. Those declarations of holy scripture, respecting everlasting punishments, contained nothing but terrifying threats. Chrysostom, who, in the great cities where he laboured, came most frequently in contact with this frivolous way of thinking, was incited, by the lively zeal which he felt against everything destructive to practical Christianity, to controvert these opinions with earnestness,* although perhaps otherwise his mild and amiable spirit might not be altogether disinclined to the doctrine of a universal restoration, with which he must have become acquainted at an earlier period, from being a disciple of Diodorus of Tarsus.†

But from two theological schools there went forth an opposition to the doctrine of everlasting punishment, which had its ground in a deeper Christian interest; inasmuch as the doctrine

* In epist. i. ad Thessal. hom. viii.; ep. ii. hom. iii.

† It is remarkable that Chrysostom in his homiletic exposition of the first epistle to the Corinthians (chap. xv. 28), mentions the opinion of those who would find in these words the doctrine of a total destruction of evil (*ἀναιρέσις τῆς κακίας*) without controverting it; see hom. xxxix., in ep. i. ad Corinth. T. X. ed. Montf. f. 372.

of a universal restoration was closely connected with the entire dogmatic systems of both these schools—namely, that of Origen, and the school of Antioch. As it concerns the former, we may remark here still another after-influence of the great Origen upon individual church-teachers whose theological education had been shaped by the study of his writings, as, for example, a Didymus,* and a Gregory Nazianzen. But this particular doctrine was expounded and maintained with the greatest logical ability and acuteness, in works written expressly for that purpose, by Gregory of Nyssa.† God, he maintained, had created rational beings, in order that they might be self-conscious and free vessels and recipients for the communications of the original fountain of all good.‡ Now, if the soul exist in a condition of harmonious correspondence with this destination, and of harmonious activity for the reception of the godlike life, it is blessed. If this harmonious relation is disturbed by that which is alien from it, by moral evil, it is wretched. The expressions reward and punishment, are but inadequate terms to denote the present existence or the disturbance of this harmony of relations; just as when the healthy eye, in the exercise of the power residing within it, perceives objects in the sun-light, or when it is prevented from so doing by disease. All punishments are means of purification, ordained by divine love with a view to purge rational beings from moral evil, and to restore them back again to that communion with God which corresponds to their nature. God would not have permitted the existence of evil, unless he had foreseen that by the redemption all rational beings would in the end, according to their destination, attain to the same blessed fellowship with himself.§

* Though in the writings of Didymus which have come to our knowledge there are no distinct traces to be found of the doctrine of restoration (*ἀποκατάστασις*), yet in the work *De trinitate* published by Mingarelli (Bologna, 1769) an intimation of this kind may be found in his exposition and application of the passage in Philippi. ii. 10. where in reference to the *καταχθονία* as well as to the *ἐπίγεια*, he speaks of the calling on the name of Christ, which extends to the salvation of all; see l. III. c. 10, 365.

† As, for example, in his exposition of 1 Corinth. xv. 28, in his *λόγος κατηχητικός*, c. 8 and 35, in his tract on the soul and on the resurrection, in his tract on the early death of children.

‡ *Ὅτι τὸν πλεῖστον τῶν θείων ἀγαθῶν μὴ ἀργὸν εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἀγγεῖται σὺν προαιρετικῶς τῶν ψυχῶν δοχίῃα.*

§ As this doctrine stands so closely connected with Gregory's whole

In like manner the doctrine of universal restoration was closely connected with the fundamental views of Theodore of Mopsuestia concerning the two great periods in the development of the rational creation, and concerning the final end of the redemption, whereby the immutability of a divine life should take the place of that mutability and exposure to temptation, which had before prevailed in the entire rational creation. Moral evil appeared, here, in fact, as a universally necessary point of transition for the development of freedom.* Diodorus of Tarsus had already unfolded this doctrine in his work, which has not come down to us, on the incarnation of the deity (*περὶ οἰκονομίας*), and Theodore exhibited it in his commentary on the gospels.† In these writings they adduced many other special reasons against the eternity of punishment. "If the rewards of eternity so far exceed good works and the brief period of life, ought not the punishments much more to be overcome by the divine mercy? God would not revive the wicked at the resurrection, if they must needs suffer only punishment without reformation." They believed they found an intimation that the degree of punishment would be proportionate to the degree of sin in Luke xii. 47; Matt. v. 26. From the fundamental principles of Theodore it also necessarily follows, though we have no distinct declaration of his own on that point, that as the antithesis of those two periods was assumed by him to embrace generally the entire rational creation, he must therefore have extended the restoration to fallen spirits as well as to mankind.

system of faith, it belongs among the worst examples of an arbitrary caprice, regardless of history, when Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople in the eighth century, in his *ἀνταποδοτικός* or *ἀνόλεντος*, endeavoured to show that all the passages in Gregory's writings, referring to this doctrine, were interpolated by heretics. See Phot. cod. 233.

* See above.

† Extracts from these writings by the Nestorian bishop Solomon of Bassora, in the thirteenth century, in Assemani, T. III. p. i. f. 323, 24; comp. the fourth of Theodore's excerpts in Marius Mercator. In Theodore's commentary on the gospel of John, so far as it remains to us, there are also to be found traces of this doctrine. But though such traces occurred in this commentary, yet, as a matter of course, passages of this kind were not received into the catenæ.

3. OPPOSITE THEOLOGICAL TENDENCIES WHICH AROSE OUT OF THE AFTER-WORKINGS OF THE ORIGENISTIC DISPUTES.

We have still to mention a series of controversies which are more loosely connected with the history of particular doctrines, and which form a whole of themselves,—the renewed controversies concerning Origen, respecting whose relation to the theological development of this period we have spoken already in the general introduction. We perceive in these disputes, first, the struggle of that more free theological tendency which started from Origen, with that other more narrow tendency clinging fast to the letter of the church doctrine, which from the beginning stood opposed to the Origenistic school, as the struggle of a more fleshly with a more spiritual tendency in the mode of apprehending Christianity. But the theological interest of these controversies was soon lost in contests of another kind, partaking more of a secular than of a spiritual interest; but then these controversies gain another important significance for us, in that they exhibit to us a hero of the faith, who, unsubdued by all persecutions and sufferings, manfully contended with spiritual weapons against the corruptions of the church which grew out of the confusion of things spiritual with things temporal.

Origen, long since pronounced a heretic in the Western church, was scarcely known among the Western theologians except by name, while those of the East were forming different parties in their various judgments concerning him. He had some enthusiastic admirers, who agreed with him in all his peculiar views, while there were other blind zealots, who looked upon him in no other light than as the father of all heresies. There were others, again, holding the middle ground betwixt these two parties, who, acknowledging his merits in relation to the progress of theology, without overlooking his defects, sought with moderation and freedom of spirit to separate the true from the false in his writings and doctrines. As the Arians could find many things in the works of Origen which seemed to furnish them with a foothold for their attacks against the Nicene creed; as they appealed, whether rightly or wrongly, to many of his assertions as justifying their own views: as the system of the Semi-Arians properly derived its origin from this father; all these circumstances would tend to

place him in an unfavourable light. The Marcellus of Ancyra, who has already been mentioned in the history of doctrinal controversies, was the first to attack Origen on this particular side. He represented him as the author of Arianism. He accused him of having stood forth as a theological writer while he was still too crude, and after studying the writings of the Greek philosophers much more than the Bible, whence he mixed up foreign Platonic doctrines with the Christian scheme of faith.* He very unjustly reproaches him, for having commenced his work *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* with the same words with which Plato begins his *Gorgias*; though these words in Origen, owing to the connection in which they occur, receive an entirely different and decidedly Christian sense, as Eusebius, the defender of Origen, very properly remarks. He objects that Origen gave this work a title borrowed from the philosophical use of language; whence he draws the arbitrary conclusion, that the subject-matter, therefore, was derived from the same fountain-head, namely, from the Greek philosophy. The great point with Marcellus was, to preserve unalloyed the simple doctrine of scripture, which led him also to oppose, generally, the too high authority ascribed to the older fathers, and to admit of no other evidence, in matters of faith, than that of the sacred scriptures.†

* "Ὅτι ἄρτι τῶν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν ἀποστὰς μαθημάτων καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ἐμιλῆσαι προελόμενος λόγος πρὸ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς τῶν γραφῶν καταλήψεως διὰ τὸ πολὺ καὶ φιλότιμον τῆς ἔξωθεν παιδείας, θάπτον τοῦ δέοντος ἀρξάμενος ὑπογράφειν, ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς φιλοσοφίας παρήχθη λόγων καὶ τινα δι' αὐτοὺς οὐ καλῶς γέγραφε. Euseb. c. Marcellum, lib. I. f. 23. Compare with this what we have said in the second volume (p. 456) respecting the intellectual training of Origen.

† The Arian Asterius, whom Marcellus controverted, had appealed in defence of his doctrine to the *δόγμα περὶ θεοῦ, ὅπερ οἱ σοφώτατοι τῶν πατέρων ἀπεφώνησαν*. There were here two things calculated to revolt Marcellus, who was so zealous in maintaining the sole and exclusive authority of the divine word: that he should call human teachers fathers, and give to their declarations the honour which is due to the sacred scriptures alone, and that he should employ the term *δόγμα* to denote the divine doctrine. He makes a distinction between *λόγος θεῖος* and *δόγμα ἀνθρώπινον*; a distinction which, though not grounded in the use of language among the church-teachers, yet is so in the original signification of the terms. His remarkable words are: *Τὸ γὰρ τοῦ δόγματος ὄνομα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔχεται βούλης τε καὶ γνώμης. Ὅτι δὲ τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει, μαρτυρεῖ μὲν ἡμῖν ἰκανῶς ἡ δογματικὴ τῶν ἱατρῶν τέχνη* (contradistinction of dogmatists and empirics) *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων καλούμενα. Ὅτι δὲ*

But other eminent church-teachers, as, for instance, Athanasius, endeavoured to show, that the Arians wrongly cited Origen as on their side. Didymus of Alexandria defended the authority of Origen, whose whole system he had adopted, so far as it did not stand in express contradiction with that which had been settled and determined in the doctrinal controversies.* Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzen published, as the result of their common studies, a Chrestomathy from the writings of Origen, with a view to the diffusion of his spiritual ideas, and particularly of his principles of interpretation.† Origen had the greatest influence on the formation of the theological system set forth by Gregory of Nyssa, in which we meet once more with many of the peculiar ideas of the great church-father, although Gregory was a perfectly independent theologian, and reproduced, with the freshness of original thought, whatever he learnt from the labours of others.

Among the monks, especially in Egypt, there were, in the fourth century, two parties of opposite spiritual bents, who also stood opposed to each other in their judgment of Origen. One of these parties, possessed of a more limited intellectual culture, and confined to a rude, fleshly mode of apprehending divine things, hated Origen as the zealous opponent of this tendency. The venerated Pachomius warned his disciples most of all against the writings of Origen, because the latter was more dangerous than other heretics, since, under the pre-

καὶ τὰ συγκλήτῳ δόξαντα ἔτι καὶ νῦν δόγματα συγκλήτου λέγεται, οὐδένα ἀγνοῖν οἶμαι. In reference to the first, Eusebius opposed to him the passage in Deut. xxxii. 7, which, falsely applied as it was, had still become classical on this point; and in reference to the use of the term δόγμα, he opposed to him the passage in Ephes. ii. 15, where he explained the word δόγματα as referring to the doctrines of Christianity: though, in fact, it must necessarily be understood of the dogmas of the law, and hence was a testimony rather in favour of Marcellus than against him.

* For the rest, the remark we made concerning the revolution of the Alexandrian spirit holds good also of Didymus, as he exhibits himself in his work De trinitate. He forms an important link in the development of the scheme peculiar to the Alexandrians, as it subsequently expressed itself in opposition to the Antiochian system; and also in the formation of the mystical theology, as it afterwards appears in the writings of the Pseudo-Dionysius.

† The φιλοκαλία.

tence of expounding the holy scriptures, he introduced into them his own erroneous doctrines. The monks of the other class, who were possessed of more cultivated minds, and of a more contemplative mystical bent, entertained a high respect for Origen, in whose works they found ample nourishment for their own spiritual tendency.

Among the former class of monks an individual had received his education, who, at the time of the first breaking out of these disputes, stood in high estimation on account of the zeal for piety and orthodoxy which he had displayed for a long series of years. This was Epiphanius. He was born in the early part of the fourth century, in the village of Besanduk, belonging to the territory of the city of Eleutheropolis in Palestine.* He had been educated among those Egyptian monks for the monastic life, and their narrow intellectual culture was transmitted to him. After this, he returned home to his native country, where he became superintendent of a cloister which he founded near the place of his birth, and in the year 367, bishop of Salamis, then called Constan̄ia, metropolis of the island of Cyprus. His writings show him to have been a man of extensive reading, but quite deficient in criticism and in logical arrangement,—possessed of sincere piety, but also of a very narrow, dogmatical spirit;—a man who was altogether unable to distinguish essentials from non-essentials in doctrinal differences, the letter from the spirit in modes of apprehending the scheme of faith, and who would be very ready to discern a dangerous heresy in every opinion on matters of faith that deviated from the one which commonly prevailed; and it was a matter of course, that, to such a man, Origen, whom he was incapable of understanding, would appear as the most dangerous of false teachers; as, in fact, in his description and critique of the heresies, he considered it especially necessary to warn his readers against *him*.

A second eminent teacher of the church, who took part in these controversies, was Jerome, a person of great merit, on account of his researches in biblical literature, and the pains he took to promote a more thorough study of the scriptures among the people of the West. That he was animated by a warm zeal for the cause of the gospel is evinced by the unwearied

* Sozom. VI. 32.

labours of his long life, for which, during his own life-time, he was rewarded from many quarters only with ingratitude. But his better qualities were obscured by the great defects of his character, by his mean passions, his easily-offended vanity, his love of controversy and of rule, his pride, so often concealed under the garb of humility. His letters and other writings testify, beyond doubt, that he knew how to bring home to the hearts of others many great truths of practical Christianity, which, from the want of Christian self-knowledge and self-control, he omitted to set before himself, and apply to his own case, on the proper occasions. Let us first cast a glance at the earlier history of the life and labours of this remarkable man, down to the time when he took part in these controversies.

Jerome was born at Strydon, on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia,* according to the Chronicle of Prosper, in the year 331, though other marks and evidences seem to point to a date some ten years later. At Rome, where the celebrated grammarian Donatus was his teacher, he enjoyed the advantages of a good literary education; and there, also, he at an early age received baptism. After various journeys, which he was induced to undertake in part by his love of knowledge, he enjoyed for some time at Antioch the instructions of the learned Apollinaris, and then withdrew from the society of men into the desert of Chalcis in Syria. The inward conflicts which had led him to seek the life of seclusion were in his case but rendered the more violent in this solitude. He had, until now, chiefly occupied himself with the study of the ancient authors, many of whom he had taken along with him from Rome. That he should find in them a good deal which was unsuited to his then ascetic bent of mind, may be well conceived. It is easy to explain also, how, in this disturbed, legal tone of mind, his conscience would upbraid him on account of his employing so much of his time on pagan literature. In the opinions entertained of this latter, we find in this period the most opposite errors. While some—either through a misconceived zeal, which, especially in such transition-epochs of the inner life, wherein the might of Christian consciousness asserted itself in a decided manner, might easily arise, or through mental indolence, which sought concealment under the guise of piety—were induced absolutely to

* According to the conjecture of some, Stridova in Hungary, on the boundaries of Stiria.

shun all intercourse with ancient literature as something that belonged to Satan's kingdom; there were at Rome ecclesiastics who studied the ancient authors even to the neglect of holy writ.* The medium between these two opposite mistakes was held by such men as Augustin, who, in his guide to the education of the clergy, says that everything true and good should be appropriated to the service of Christianity; and that even from the Pagans should be taken the silver and gold which, in truth, they had not themselves created, but only brought to light out of the stores of an omnipresent providence.†

Now, when Jerome, in the midst of the severe ascetic discipline to which he subjected himself, felt his conscience reproach him on account of the predilection he had hitherto shown for the Pagan literature, we may easily explain how it might happen, that, in a violent attack of fever brought on by his rigid austerities, and his abstinence from food in the Quadragesimal fasts, his thoughts should shape themselves into that vision, which, by his own fault and that of his later antagonist (Rufinus), became magnified to an undue importance. He thought that he appeared before the judgment-seat of God. When, to the question put to him, he answered, "I am a Christian," it was said, "thou art not a Christian, but a Ciceronean; for where thy treasure is there is thy heart also;" and under the infliction of the lash he made a solemn vow never to take into his hand another pagan book. This oath he assuredly did not consider himself bound strictly to keep, as is proved by

* As Jerome complains, in his letter to the Roman bishop Damasus, ep. 146 (according to Martianay, T. III. f. 160): At nunc sacerdotes Dei, omissis evangelis et prophetis, videas comœdias legere.

† Quod eorum tanquam aurum et argentum, quod non ipsi instituerunt, sed de quibusdam quasi metallis divinæ providentiæ, quæ ubique infusa est, eruerunt. De doctrina Christiana, l. II. s. 60. Here belongs also the advice which Isidore of Pelusium gives to an anagnost in the course of training for the spiritual office. He would most profit himself and others, if he devoted his whole life to the study of the sacred scriptures, but at the same time also appropriated what he could make use of from the ancient literature in the service of Christianity, ὅσον χρῆσιμον ἐκ τῆς ἔξωθεν παιδείας, ὅσπερ ἡ μέλιττα, δρεψάμενος, πικρὰ γὰρ ἀρετῆς ἐνεκεν πεφιλοσοφῆκασι. Lib. II. ep. 3. Among the Greek church-teachers such views were by no means uncommon. The above-mentioned Isidore, however, censures an anchorite in reference to his peculiar purpose of life, because he spent his time chiefly in reading the pagan writers. Lib. I. ep. 63.

the frequent accurate quotations from ancient authors in his writings; unless we credit the solemn assurance of Jerome himself, in answer to the charge of perjury brought against him by Rufinus, that he made all these citations simply from memory. Possibly he differed in his own judgment respecting this vision in different moods of mind, passions, and situations. Where he wished to dissuade from the reading of the heathen authors he represented this as being a supernatural vision * and thus furnished Rufinus a good reason for accusing him of self-contradiction and of perjury.† And Jerome could adduce nothing in his own vindication, except, first, that he had really read no pagan author since his conversion, and cited everything from mere memory,—a statement against which Rufinus could urge many plausible objections; and secondly, that the whole was but a dream, and what was done in a dream was a thing of no account.‡ This little trait is not without its importance as opening a glimpse into the character of Jerome. Veracity or untrustworthiness of character is often indicated in the plainest manner by the merest trifles.

As other monks endeavoured to occupy the lower powers of nature on various kinds of handicrafts, and thereby to escape many inward temptations, so Jerome chose, instead of these, a kind of discipline which came nearer to his calling, and from which he could gain more that would be profitable to the church. He learnt from a Jew the Hebrew language.§ He was after-

* Ep. 18 ad Eustochium, where he adduces in proof of the reality of the thing the *liventes scapulas*, and that he *plagas sensisse post somnum*, which, in case he remembers rightly, still admits of being easily explained.

† Rufin says, in his *invectiva* against Jerome, l. II. f. 285, T. V. ed. Martianay, not without truth: *Relegantur nunc quæso quæ scribit, si una ejus operis pagina est, quæ non eum iterum Ciceronianum pronunciet, ubi non dicat: sed Tullius noster, sed Flaccus noster, sed Maro. Jam vero Chrysippum et Aristidem, Empedoclem, et cætera Græcorum auctorum nomina, ut doctus videatur et plurimæ lectionis, tanquam fumos et nebulas lectoribus spargit.*

‡ Hæc dicerem, si quippiam vigilans promississem; nunc autem novum impudentiæ genus objicit mihi somnium meum. Sed tamen qui somnium criminatur, audiat prophetarum voces, s. omniis non esse credendum. Adv. Rufin. l. I. f. 385. T. IV. ed. Martianay.

§ Incentiva vitiorum ardoremque naturæ ferre non poteram, quem quam crebris jejuniis frangerem, mens tamen cogitationibus æstuabat. Ad quam edomandam cuidam fratri, qui ex Hebræis crediderat, me in disciplinam dedi. Ep. 95 (or 4) ad Rusticum.

wards ordained as a presbyter at Antioch; and, between the years 379 and 380, made a journey to Constantinople, drawn by the invitation of Gregory Nazianzen. By the latter his attention was first particularly directed to Origen, of whose exegetical writings he from this time forward availed himself in many ways; and of whose homilies he translated several into Latin. Then he journeyed to Rome in 382, on a visit to the bishop Damasus, with whom at an earlier period he had already entered into friendly relations, and the latter availed himself of his various knowledge by making him his secretary and adviser in church matters; by which office he must have become very accurately versed in ecclesiastical affairs, as the most important passed through his own hands.* Here he gained many enthusiastic friends, but made also many violent enemies. As a promoter of monasticism in a country where it was as yet but little loved, in the great capital where the rigidly ascetic tendency came into collision with the propensities and interests of many, he could not fail, even on this score, to incur the hatred of numbers, both of the clergy and laity; and as he induced ladies and maidens of the noblest families, by the enthusiasm for the ascetic life with which he inspired them, to forsake their worldly relations, and in some cases to retire to a life of solitude in Palestine, so by this means he vexed and irritated some of the most eminent citizens of Rome. To these occasions of offence must be added the strong contrast of his erudition with the ignorance which prevailed among many of the Roman clergy, which superiority Jerome, in his usual way, took no pains to hide, but, on the other hand, endeavoured to make them feel; and also the peculiarly sarcastic manner in which he exposed and chastised the faults of the worldly-minded clergy in Rome, particularly in a widely-circulated letter addressed to the nun Eustochium; so that Rufinus afterwards accused him of putting weapons into the hands of the Pagans against the Christians.† But as long as Damasus lived Jerome was sufficiently protected by his authority. But, as he died in the

* Jerome, ep. 11 (or 91) ad Ageruchiam: Cum in chartis ecclesiasticis juvarem Damasum et orientis atque occidentis synodicis consultationibus responderem.

† Rufinus, l. II. invectiv.: Ea quæ gentiles falso in nos conferre crimina putabantur ista vera esse, imo multo pejora a nostris geri quam illi criminabantur asseruit. Certainly an unjust charge.

year 384, and his successor Siricius seems not to have been so favourably disposed towards Jerome, he saw himself under the necessity of yielding to the great number of his enemies, and he determined to withdraw from Babylon, as he was accustomed from this time forth to denominate Rome.*

Bethlehem, the place of resort for many monks, now became the seat of his activity, where, under his guidance, young men were educated in sacred studies, and where, by the composition of his voluminous works, relating chiefly to the exposition of the sacred scriptures, he made himself extremely useful to the whole Western church. The like services, which had been rendered to the Oriental church by Origen, in correcting the original text of the New Testament, and the Greek translation of the Old, Jerome rendered to the West by his corrections of the Latin version of the Bible, now become greatly distorted by the blending together of different translations, the mixing up with each other of the different gospels, and the ignorance of transcribers.† Summoned to the task by the Roman bishop Damasus, who perceived the need of such a correction of the text, he had already, while at Rome, amended the translation of the gospels, and completed the same task on the version of the Psalms. At Bethlehem, supported by the Hexapla of Origen, which he obtained from the library at Cæsarea, he extended this work to the whole Bible. Even this was a bold undertaking, by which he must expose himself to be loaded with reproaches on the part of those who, in their ignorance, which they identified with a pious simplicity,‡ were wont to condemn every deviation from the traditional text, however necessary or salutary it might be. They were very ready to see, in any change of the only text which was known to them, a falsification, without inquiring any farther into the reason of the alteration.§ And yet here he had in his favour the au-

* Ep. 99 ad Asellum, when just ready to embark: Ora, ut de Babylone Hierosolymam regrediar. And in the preface to his translation of the tract by Didymus on the Holy Spirit: Cum in Babylone versarer et purpuratæ meretricis essem colonus.

† Tot exemplaria quot codices, says Jerome, ep. 125 ad Damasum.

‡ A class of men widely diffused in the Western church, against whom Jerome says many excellent things in defence of employing science in the service of the church. Piscatorum se discipulos asserentes, quasi ideo sancti sint, si nihil scierint. Ep. 102 ad Marcellum.

§ Jerome in his preface to Damasus: Quis enim doctus pariter vel

therity of a Roman bishop, as well as the fact, that in this case it was impossible to oppose to him a translation established and transmitted by ecclesiastical authority, or a divine inspiration of the text hitherto received.

But he must have given far greater offence by another useful undertaking; viz., a new version of the Old Testament, not according to the Alexandrian translation, which before this had alone been regarded, but according to the Hebrew. This appeared to many, even of those who did not belong to the class of ignorant persons, a great piece of impiety, to pretend to understand the Old Testament better than the seventy inspired interpreters—better than the Apostles who had followed this translation, and who would have given another translation if they had considered it to be necessary—to allow one's self to be so misled by Jews, as for their accommodation to falsify the writings of the Old Testament.*

At that time there was formed, in and about Jerusalem, a noble society of like-minded theologians, who agreed together in their zeal for the advancement of theological science. With Jerome lived, on terms of the most intimate union, the friend of his youth, the presbyter Rufinus of Aquileia, who was residing at Jerusalem with the bishop John, with whom he stood in the most friendly relations. All three shared in the same love for the writings of Origen. Jerome had, indeed, sought to make several of his works more widely known in the Western church by means of translations, and had in his prefaces spoken of him with the greatest admiration. The spiritual bent of Jerome was beyond all question quite different from that of Origen. Certainly, he had never made himself master of his whole doctrinal system, as, in general, he was destitute of the mental impulse to form a system. His peculiar intellectual discernment was directed rather on particulars than on the general principles. And it might be for this very reason that, in making use of Origen in his biblical commentaries, he adopted several of his expositions, which were of

indoctus, cum in manus volumen assumserit, et a saliva quam semel imberit, viderit discrepare quod lectitat, non statim erumpit in voces: me falsarium, me clamans esse sacrilegum, qui audeam aliquid in veterum libris addere, mutare, corrigere.

* All this Rufinus strenuously urges against Jerome in the second book of his invective: *Istud nefas quomodo expiabitur, ipsam legem pervertere in aliud, quam Apostoli tradiderunt.*

such a kind as to agree neither with his own other views of the faith nor with the dominant church system, without deeming it necessary to utter a word of warning until his attention had been directed by others to this opposition of views. But free and unfettered as Jerome was on this side, while he was left to himself, he could, nevertheless, easily be made narrow and confined by causes without himself, when anything was pointed out to him which was opposed to the orthodoxy of the church, and he had reason to apprehend he might be suspected of any such thing himself. Anxiously solicitous for the reputation of his orthodoxy, he was on this side extremely sensitive.

Now it happened, about the year 394, that among the many who made the pilgrimage from the West to the holy cities in Palestine, several of the zealots for the letter of the church scheme of doctrine, such as Aterbius, and still later Vigilantius, were among the number. They had always been used to hear Origen spoken of as one of the most dangerous of false teachers, without knowing anything more of him; and hence they were greatly alarmed when they were compelled to observe that the writings of this father were here so much read, and that his name was held in such high veneration. These zealots, then, could not refrain from giving free utterance to their fears. The bishop John and Rufinus were not so ready to give way and indulge these people as Jerome was. It was of great importance to the latter to take care that no suspicion of his orthodoxy should be whispered in the Roman and Western church. He was ready, therefore, to justify himself by joining in the sentence of condemnation against the false doctrines of Origen, which he might do without relinquishing his own convictions, though, were it not for this outward challenge, he would never, perhaps, have felt himself constrained to do any such thing. Subsequent to this time Jerome was more cautious, it is true, in expressing his judgments concerning Origen; but he still continued to declare himself respecting him with a wise moderation, saying that, on the maxim of Paul, which directs us to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good, he endeavoured to make the same use of Origen as he did of other biblical expositors, appropriating what was valuable in his writings, while he avoided his errors.

Yet he makes it quite manifest, that if no mid-way course could be allowed to exist betwixt the extravagant admirers and the all-condemning opponents of Origen, he would prefer joining himself to the latter, because they were the most pious.* On this principle Jerome actually proceeded, yielding to the zealots for orthodoxy, and espousing their side, since they would allow of no neutrality and no middle ground. In addition to this, there were also sources of personal irritation, the influence of which, in a person of his sensitive and passionate temper, easily intermingled with the doctrinal interest.

The cry against the Origenistic heresies at Jerusalem alarmed and disturbed the aged Epiphanius, who, in respect to such matters, was as excitable as he was credulous. He came himself to Jerusalem in 394, where he was received by the populace with great demonstrations of respect, and, as was alleged against him by the bishop John, gave way perhaps too much to these respectful attentions. He strenuously insisted, in his interviews with the bishop John, that he ought to condemn Origen, the father of Arius and of all other heresies. The bishop explained that he was accustomed in reading Origen to separate the true from the false, but he avoided entering into any doctrinal investigations with Epiphanius, whose prejudices he would hardly have been able to overcome, and with whom he could hardly have come to any understanding on this matter. Epiphanius, however, preached a discourse, in which he inveighed with great warmth against the defenders of Origen's false doctrines, so that, as it was doubtless well understood whom he meant, disturbances were to be apprehended. The bishop John warned him, therefore, through his arch-deacon, during the delivering of the sermon. Afterwards John himself preached against the anthropomorphites. Epiphanius next mounted the pulpit and joined in the condemnation of anthropomorphism, but declared that it was necessary also to condemn the Origenists.

Displeased with what had taken place at Jerusalem, and still more confirmed in his suspicion that at Jerusalem the Origenistic party was dominant, he betook himself to the monks at Bethlehem, where his influence was unbounded. He

* See ep. 75 (26) ad Vigilantium, ep. 76 ad Tranquillinum.

warned them against having any fellowship with the erroneous doctrines entertained at Jerusalem, and subsequently often repeated this warning. A part of the monks separated themselves from all church-fellowship with the bishop John. Under these circumstances, Epiphanius took a step which, at a time of such great excitement, he ought above all things to have avoided, and which, as the case stood, certainly exposes him to the suspicion of a set design. He ordained as a presbyter Paullinianus, Jerome's brother—as he affirmed, without any preconcerted plan—in a cloister belonging to his own diocese; and the latter could now perform the priestly functions for the monks in Bethlehem, so that they were no longer under the necessity of having recourse for these purposes to Jerusalem. The bishop John might very properly complain of it as a violation of ecclesiastical rules, that a foreign bishop should ordain an ecclesiastic from his own diocese. A violent controversy in writing ensued, in which John complained solely of Epiphanius' love of rule and disorderly conduct, avoiding as much as possible all mention of doctrinal matters, while Epiphanius made the latter the principal topic of his remarks, and called upon the bishop John to clear himself from the suspicion of holding to the errors of Origen. Jerome embraced with eagerness the party of Epiphanius, and thus the ancient tie of friendship was severed. The bishop John applied with his complaints to Alexandria and to Rome. Jerome wrote to both churches in defence of the common cause. In vain did the bishop Theophilus of Alexandria endeavour, through his presbyter Isidore—who was himself, however, as an Origenist, suspected by the party of Epiphanius and Jerome—to bring about a reconciliation. Yet, near the close of the year 396, the matter had progressed so far, that Jerome and Rufinus became reconciled at the altar, and the peace of the church in this country was once more restored.

But although the friendly relations between Jerome and Rufinus seemed outwardly to be restored again, yet the communion of spirits which had once been disturbed, certainly could not be so easily renewed, especially in the case of so irritable and suspicious a person as Jerome. It needed but a slight occasion to tear open again the slightly-healed wound; and this was given by Rufinus, though without any intention on his part, yet certainly not without his fault. In the year 397

he returned from his travels back to the West, and repaired to Rome. There he was induced, as he says, by the wishes of his friend Macarius* (who being engaged in writing a work against the astrological fate, was desirous of learning the views of Origen on this subject) to translate Origen's work *Περὶ ἀρχῶν* into Latin. Now this, after what had taken place before, was manifestly a very unwise undertaking. This book, of all others, was directly calculated to stir up anew the narrow-minded zealots of the Roman church against Origen; and as the peculiar ideas of this work were so perfectly alien from the theological spirit of the Roman church, no good whatever would result from making it known by a translation. But Rufinus did not even furnish the means for studying and understanding Origen as a historical phenomenon. He himself was too much carried away with wonder at the great man, and too much fettered by the dependence of his own mind on the dominant scheme of the church, to be able rightly to understand Origen in his theological development. He was too little acquainted with the relation of the hidden depths of the Christian life and consciousness to the progressive evolution of the conception of them in time, to be able to form any correct judgment of the relation of Origen's theology to the church scheme of doctrine in his own age. He took the liberty to modify the doctrines of Origen, especially in those passages which had reference to the Trinity, according to the decisions of the council of Nice; but he frankly confesses, also, in the preface to his translation, that in such places he has not rendered the sense of Origen according to the existing readings. Only he affirms that he had introduced no foreign matter, but had simply restored the original reading, which had been corrupted by heretics, as the harmony with other passages required. But then, as he did not consistently carry through even this method, but left many passages unaltered, which sounded no less heretical to these times, so he exposed himself none the less to be accused by the zealots of having found then

* From this *Roman* writer (in distinction from two famous monks of the same name, belonging to the Scetic desert in Egypt) Gennadius, who represents him, however, perhaps wrongly, to have been a monk (c. 28 de V. J.), mentions a *liber adversus mathematicos*, in which he had made great use of the Greek church-teachers, which agrees with the testimony of Rufinus.

in those passages nothing which would be considered as heretical,—in spite of his protestations, that, in this translation, it was not his design to exhibit his own views, but the original doctrines of Origen, and that nothing else was to be learned from it but these. At the same time, though perfectly aware of Jerome's excitable temper, and of the narrow and passionate spirit which characterized his principal friends at Rome, he was still imprudent enough to refer in his preface to the praise bestowed on Origen by Jerome, and to the similar plan of translating his works into Latin, which the latter had adopted.

Scarcely was there time for this translation and preface to become known in Rome, when it excited among those people the most vehement feelings of surprise and displeasure. Two noble Romans, Psammachius and Oceanus, who had kept up a correspondence with Jerome ever since the period of his residence in Rome, were extremely concerned for the reputation of his orthodoxy, and hastened to inform him of the scandal given to the Christians at Rome by Rufinus. They called upon him, by a faithful translation of that work, to exhibit Origen in his true colours, and to clear himself from the suspicion of entertaining the same doctrines of Origen, which Rufinus had cast upon him.* Jerome wrote back in a tone of high-wrought excitement to his two friends and to Rufinus. Even at present, however, he continued to express himself with the same moderation concerning Origen; he spoke highly of his great gifts, of his Christian ardour, of his merits as an expounder of the Scriptures:—and he pronounced those to be the worst enemies of the great man, who had taken pains to publish those writings of his which ought to have remained concealed. “Let us not,” said he, “imitate the faults of the man whose excellences lie beyond our reach.” But the relations betwixt Jerome and Rufinus grew continually more hostile, and both of them in controversial, or, more properly speaking, abusive tracts, full of passionate language, forgot their dignity both as theologians and as Christians; as Augustin had the frankness to tell Jerome, when he called upon him for their own sakes, and out of respect to the weak, for whom Christ died, to put an

* Ep. 40. *Purga ergo suspiciones hominum, et convince criminantem, ne si dissimulaveris, consentire videaris.*

end to these revilings.* The influence of Jerome's powerful patrons, in Rome, however, could not hinder Rufinus from being justified by a letter addressed to him from the Roman bishop Siricius. The more zealously, therefore, did they exert themselves to excite a more unfriendly feeling towards Rufinus in the mind of Anastasius, who, in the year 399, succeeded Siricius. But it was chiefly the influence of Marcella, a widow, and ancient friend of Jerome, which contributed to inspire in the mind of this Roman bishop (who, according to his own confession,† had, until now, heard but little or nothing about Origen) great anxiety and solicitude with regard to the spread of the Origenistic heresies.‡ Rufinus was summoned before his tribunal. He excused himself, it is true, on account of his great distance, and for other reasons, from personally making his appearance at Rome; but he sent in a letter of defence and justification, containing a full and explicit confession of his faith, appealing to the fact that on the question respecting the origin of the soul nothing had as yet been determined by the church; and declaring that he, as a translator, was in nowise responsible for the assertions of the writer translated by him. Anastasius, in the public declarations which he thereupon made, expressed himself with great violence against Origen, and also unfavourably towards Rufinus. Meantime, however, the controversy respecting Origen had taken a turn which led to far more important consequences than would otherwise have followed it, and which combined with it such an interest of another sort as caused its original object to be forgotten.

We have remarked already, in an earlier part of this history, that the patriarch Theophilus, of Alexandria, had endeavoured to effect a reconciliation betwixt the two contending parties in this controversy. He was at first closely connected with the

* Vide Augustin. ep. 73, s. 8. *Heu mihi, qui vos alicubi simul invenire non possum, forte ut moveor, ut doleo, ut timeo, prociderem ad pedes vestras, flerem quantum valerem, rogarem quantum amarem, nunc unumquemque vestrum pro seipso, nunc utrumque pro alterutro, et pro aliis, et maxime infirmis, pro quibus Christus mortuus est.*

† The words of Anastasius, in his letter to the bishop John, are beyond question very obscure, and the sense cannot be given with certainty: *Origines autem antea et quis fuerit, et in quæ processerit verba, nostrum propositum nescit.*

‡ Jerome, in ep. 96 ad Principiam, pronounces it the peculiar glory of the deceased Marcella: *Damnationis hæreticorum hæc fuit principium.*

Origenistic party among the Egyptian monks; as the aged presbyter Isidore, who had great influence with him, belonged to this party; and he agreed with them in opposing that crass and sensuous mode of apprehending divine things, which prevailed among the so-called *Anthropomorphites*, the monks of the Scetic desert. But on the principles of this individual little dependence could be placed; for worldly interests and passions had more power over him than principles and rational convictions, and he was unfavourably known under a name signifying a man of instability, who was wont to accommodate himself to the change of circumstances.*

As the bishops of Alexandria, in the programmes with which at the feast of Epiphany they made known the precise time of the Easter festival next to be celebrated, were accustomed to unfold such particular topics of Christian faith and practice as were adapted to the times; so, in the year 399, Theophilus chose for this purpose to combat the rude sensuous notions respecting that which constituted God's image in man, and—what was closely connected with this point—respecting the divine essence itself.* Now this certainly was by no means the best way to instruct and convince the monks who were addicted to those erroneous doctrines; for, as the case really was with them, being for the most part men wholly without cultivation, and coming from the lower ranks of society, and quite devoid of all sense for matters purely spiritual, it was impossible for them to apprehend that which was contained in their religious consciousness in any other way than in forms of conception borrowed wholly from sense: and this sensuous form of apprehension had become so fused and blended with the matter of their religious consciousness, that he who robbed them of the one, seemed also to deprive them of the other. Hence it was that the discourse of Theophilus met, among the Scetic monks, with a reception so expressive of violent indignation, that but one abbot, namely, Paphnutius, had the boldness to read it publicly, and this reading produced among the monks a violent ferment. At the head of the *Anthropomorphites* in this district, stood Serapion, a monk whose rigidly abstemious life had procured for him the highest reverence and respect. Already it had become a matter of rejoicing, that the united labours of

* 'Ο ἀμφοαλλὰξ ὁ κόθυρος, terms applied to one who is accustomed to wear his cloak according to the wind.

many individuals, who entered with him into a comparison of scripture passages, had been so far crowned with success, as that Serapion seemed to be convinced his notions of the divine image and of the divine essence were not tenable; but as they were about to unite together in a prayer of thanks for this happy issue, and Serapion kneeled down for prayer with the rest, he missed the image under which he was wont to adore the God present to his heart, and felt that he was still unable to dispense with it. With the customary symbol, it seemed to him that the being whom he worshipped under this symbol, was himself taken away. Full of despondency, the old man exclaimed with tears, "Poor wretch that I am! They have taken away my God. On whom shall I now depend? To whom shall I pray?"* A fierce troop of savage monks next hastened to Alexandria, and threatened Theophilus, whom they denounced as an atheist, with death. Theophilus, with whom prevarication and falsehood cost but little, contrived to soothe them in a most unworthy manner, saying to them, "In you I behold the countenance of God." This appeared to the monks to be a confirmation of their notions of the divine image, and even by this remark they were somewhat pacified. Yet they required also of the patriarch, that he should condemn the godless Origen, and in this, too, he yielded to their demands.†

At that time, Theophilus doubtless yielded only because he was forced to do so by the frantic demands of these blind zealots, but not with any design of abiding by this forced declaration. By degrees, however, the temper and disposition of his mind underwent, through influences from without, an entire change towards the Origenistic monks. This party had its principal seat in the caverns and cells of the Salt-Petre mountain which bordered on the Scetic desert. Here for a series of years had resided the deacon Evagrius of Pontus, famous on account of his ascetic writings, which were extensively read not only in the Greek Church, but after they had been translated into Latin by Rufinus, even in the church of the West.‡ At the head of this party stood, at this time, the

* See the account by Cassian, an eye-witness. Collat. 10.

† See Sozom. VIII. 11.

‡ He was a disciple of the two men who had a great influence on the monastic life as it was in this desert, and who stood in high veneration. Macarius, who was surnamed *Αἰγύπτιος*, and Macarius, who, from being a

four brothers, Dioscurus, Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, well known under the name of the tall brothers (*ἀδελφοὶ μακροί*)—pious men, though not wholly exempt from a certain fanatical, ascetic tendency. Theophilus, who was very friendly to these men, was desirous of gaining them over to the service of the church, for which, however, they had no inclination. At length he compelled Dioscurus to assume the office of bishop of Hermopolis in Egypt;—to two others he gave the place of stewards (*οἰκόνομοι*) in his own church. But precisely in the administration of *this* office, they had occasion to experience so many things derogatory to the bishop's character, which filled them with disgust, while, at the same time, these honest men feared they should contract some defilement on their own souls, that nothing could prevent them from hastening back to their own beloved seclusion, under the pretext that they were no longer able to endure the city life. But Theophilus penetrated their real motive, and on this ground alone was greatly incensed. Added to this was the influence of another occurrence. The presbyter Isidore, already mentioned, a friend of those monks, and superintendent of an alms-house in Alexandria—a man now eighty years old—had received from a wealthy widow the sum of a thousand gold pieces, for the purpose of purchasing clothing for the poor females in Alexandria. In handing over the money she had made him promise not to mention the matter to the bishop, whose all-grasping and all-expending rage for building* she was afraid of. The discovery of this secret aroused the whole wrath of Theophilus against Isidore.† Under the pretext of false charges he

native of Alexandria, was called *πρωτικὸς*. Under the name of the former we have fifty homilies, which indeed are not quoted by the ancient writers as his, but which harmonize perfectly with the peculiar Christian bent of this monasticism.

* *Ὁ χρυσομανὴς καὶ λιβολάτης*—so he is called by Isidore of Pelusium, l. I. ep. 152.

† Such is the account of the warm friend of Chrysostom and of the Originistic monks the bishop Palladius of Helenopolis in Bithynia, in his dialogical narrative of Chrysostom's life. Opp. Chrysost. ed. Mont. T. XIII. The account by Sozomen, VIII. 12, serves to confirm the former, for it seems to presuppose this as the original one. According to Sozomen's account, for instance, Theophilus demanded of Isidore part of a large sum of money which had been given him, for the purpose of expending it on church buildings; but Isidore declined to give it up, because it was better, he said, to use the money in behalf of the living

persecuted him with the utmost violence, deposed him from his office, and excommunicated him from the church, till at last the persecuted Isidore took refuge among the monks in the desert of Nitria. These having received their ancient friend, drew down on themselves the vengeance of Theophilus, whose feelings were already embittered towards them. For the purpose of gratifying these revengeful feelings, Theophilus took sides with the zealots against Origen, first with the Anthropomorphites of the Scetic desert, whose fury he excited against the Origenists; and with Jerome and Epiphanius. He found no difficulty, at several synods convened in Alexandria subsequent to the year 399,* to prevail upon bishops, in part already inclined by their own narrow zeal, to stigmatize Origen as a heretic, and in part accustomed to serve as the blind tools of their patriarch, to unite with himself in pronouncing sentence of condemnation on the doctrines and the writings of Origen, and in forbidding them to be read. As the monks were not disposed to yield a blind obedience to these decrees, Theophilus seized upon this as a pretext for calling upon the Præfect of Egypt for an armed band to attack them.† They were fallen upon in their peaceful retreats, where for a long series of years they had lived in quiet seclusion, shamefully abused, and forced to disperse. Eighty of these persecuted men fled from their desert to one place and another, but could nowhere find a home; since Theophilus sent after them letters dictated by violent passion and malicious cunning, in which he seized upon many extravagances of fanatical asceticism (which he had before been very ready to overlook) for the purpose of rendering them suspected as wild and dangerous enthusiasts. At length they resolved to seek redress from the imperial court at Constantinople; in temple of God. True, this account is referred back to the Origenistic monks, the same source from which Sozomen's acquaintance had heard it; but the predicates which Isidore applies to Theophilus render the thing very credible. Isidore of Pelusium also traces the whole to the hostility of Theophilus towards the other Isidore: *Τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἑμὸν ὁμόνυμον ἀπίχθειαν καὶ δυσμένειαν*. The other causes which are stated of the hostility of Theophilus, may have first given occasion for his altered tone towards Isidore.

* Sulpicius Severus (Dial. i. 6) mentions several synods.

† Sulpicius Severus, who at that time was residing in this country, says, (Dialog. i. c. 7 :) *Scævo exemplo ad regendam ecclesiæ disciplinam præfectus assumitur*.

hopes, too, that the well-known Christian philanthropy of the bishop of the residential city, *John Chrysostom*,* who was not less favourably known for his reckless zeal against all wrong and injustice, than for his brilliant eloquence, would serve to defend them against the unrighteous fury of their adversaries. But before we proceed to the farther development of these events, we must throw a glance at the life of the great man, who was thus drawn into a participation in these disputes.

He was born at Antioch in the year 347. His pious mother, Anthusa, who, being early left a widow, devoted herself entirely to his education, was to him what Monica was to Augustin. But the seeds of faith, sown in his infant mind, were not, as in the case of Augustin, long kept in check by the predominance of wild passions ; and without experiencing such violent storms and struggles in his more gentle soul, he was enabled to develop himself with a quiet and gradual progress, under many favourable influences, as we have already remarked (p. 417). Through a rich inward experience, he dived into the understanding of the holy scriptures ; and a prudent method of interpretation on logical and grammatical principles, kept him in the right track in deriving the spirit from the letter of the sacred volume. His profound and simple, yet fruitful homiletic method of treating the holy scriptures, shows to what extent he was indebted to both, and how, in his case, both coöperated together.

By the study of the ancients he secured to himself the advantage of a harmonious mental and rhetorical culture, which in his case was ennobled by the *divine* principle of life drawn from the gospel. A heart full of the love which flows from faith, gave to his native eloquence, cultivated by the study of the ancients, its animating charm.

The man who had been thus educated for the office of a preacher, laboured twelve years, from 386 onward, with burning zeal, as a presbyter under the bishop Flavian of Antioch ; and the latter, in consideration of his distinguished gifts, had entrusted to his particular care the religious instruction and edification of the church. The sermons which he there preached show how earnestly alive he was to the duty of promoting not a formal orthodoxy, but vital Christianity ; to expose the vanity of a merely outward Christianity, and to

* The admiration of his eloquence soon gave him this surname.

destroy all confidence in it. With a freedom and boldness which feared no consequences, he inveighed against the prevailing corruptions in every rank of society, even when they appeared under a Christian guise. In Antioch he had won the affections of many, to whom his labours had proved a blessing; and the hatred of individuals, who felt themselves too roughly handled by his discourses, could, under these circumstances, do him no injury.

But a wider and more splendid, though, at the same time, a far more dangerous and unquiet field of labour was opened for him, when Eutropius, who, at that time, possessed unbounded influence at the imperial court, and who, happening to be one of his hearers on a certain occasion, was quite carried away by his eloquence, was the occasion of his being called, in the year 397, to the bishopric of Constantinople. Peculiarly dangerous was this field for a man of his freedom of spirit, so used to chastise every form of ungodliness without respect of persons—a man who, in his impatient indignation at wickedness and zeal for oppressed innocence, could not stop to measure his words by the rules of prudence. The way in which he diminished the pomp and state of the episcopacy, for the purpose of devoting what was thus saved to benevolent institutions, displeased the people of Constantinople, who were so fond of display, and excited the discontent of those whose selfish interests were injured thereby. Worldly-minded ecclesiastics and monks, whom he reminded of their duty, became his enemies. At a visitation of the churches, which he was obliged to make at Ephesus, in the year 400, on account of certain disputes and the difficulties which grew out of them, he greatly contributed, by the severity with which he sought to enforce respect for the ecclesiastical laws, so often violated by reason of the prevailing worldly interest, to increase the number of his enemies, especially among the higher ranks of the clergy. Doubtless it may have been the case, also, that in certain moments of vehement indignation against sin, which proceeded however from the purest motives, he allowed himself to be transported beyond measure; and too rashly undertaking to promote the right and to punish what was bad, did not always pay due respect to existing forms. Perhaps, too, he may have occasionally placed too much confidence in his arch-deacon Serapion, a passionate man, and been persuaded

by him to the adoption of measures which had not been carefully weighed.

Not less surely must he in various ways have excited against him the most powerful personages about court, by the manner in which he chastised the prevailing vices and took part with the innocent against their oppressors. Eutropius himself, who in the most insolent manner abused his power to the ruin of many, was the first to become his violent enemy; but when the prophetic warnings of the man who alone dealt honestly with him, were verified, and he saw himself at the lowest ebb of fortune, forsaken by all, Chrysostom was his only protector at the altar of the church, to which he had fled for refuge from the infuriated populace.

The ambitious and covetous empress Eudoxia often fell into violent transports of rage against Chrysostom, which she vented in the most bitter threats, when she imagined herself to be aimed at by anything he had uttered in his sermons; when he protected orphans and widows from her own avarice or resentment, or from that of her favourites; when he opposed the acts of injustice of which she was the author, and addressed her conscience with the earnest sincerity of a bishop. Thus, there had grown up at Constantinople a party of ill-disposed ecclesiastics and nobles, men and women, in opposition to the man of truly pious and noble feelings; and sometimes this party was led on by the empress herself, whose superstitious fears, however, often compelled her to become reconciled again to the venerated bishop.

It happened precisely at an interval of this sort, when Chrysostom stood on good terms with the empress, that the monks above-mentioned arrived at Constantinople. They entreated the bishop to grant them protection, declaring to him, that if he refused it, they would be forced to apply immediately to the emperor. Chrysostom knew how to unite what was required of him by Christian charity with the circumspection of Christian prudence.* He wished and hoped he might be able to settle the difficulty in the wisest way by offering his own mediation to bring about a reconciliation between Theophilus

* If we may credit the report of Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, who wrote, indeed, as a prejudiced friend of Chrysostom, but is confirmed, however, though he reports many things alone, at least in part by the authorities of Socrates and Sozomen.

and these unfortunate men; and in order to this it was necessary for him to avoid any step which might offend the man whose irritable character was well known to him. He gave the monks a friendly reception; he assigned them a place of abode, and one of the pious females who were accustomed, under his direction, to devote their property or the labour of their hands to works of Christian charity, provided for their bodily wants; but in compliance with the ecclesiastical rules, he refused to admit them to the communion, since they had been excommunicated by their bishop. In a letter which he wrote in their behalf to the bishop Theophilus, he earnestly besought the latter to pardon the monks, as a favour to himself; but Theophilus, instead of paying any attention to this request, immediately despatched certain persons to Constantinople for the purpose of lodging an accusation against the monks. The latter now proceeded, on their part, to bring a number of aggravated charges against their bishop. Chrysostom sent a report of this to Theophilus, informing him that it would be out of his power to prevent them from applying with their complaints to the emperor himself. By this Theophilus was still more excited; especially, as he had been told by persons who were very desirous of stirring up a quarrel between him and Chrysostom, that the latter had admitted the monks to the communion, and thus declared null the sentence which Theophilus had pronounced against them. In his reply, Theophilus reminded Chrysostom that according to the fifth canon of the Council of Nice,* every bishop was bound to recognize as valid the sentence of excommunication pronounced by another, till its injustice was proved by a new investigation, which, however, could be commenced and carried through only in the church diocese in which the difficulty had occurred. By this law, it is true, cases like the present one stood a very uneven chance; for how could the poor monks in the church diocese of Theophilus, where everything was so entirely dependent on himself, hope to find anywhere among the bishops an equitable decision? Chrysostom now endeavoured to extricate himself from the whole affair. But the monks availed themselves of a favourable moment to lay their petition before the empress Eudoxia, in which they

* Compare the account by Palladius with the words of Chrysostom himself, in his first letter to Innocent bishop of Rome, s. 2.

proposed that the bishop of the imperial residence should be nominated judge in this matter, and that Theophilus should be compelled to appear before his tribunal. The empress, in whom superstition and immorality wrought in concert together, placed great store on the blessing of such monks. To obtain this she received their petition, and easily found means of persuading her husband, over whom her influence was unbounded, to comply with their request. Theodore was summoned to Constantinople, where a synod under the presidency of the patriarch was to decide his case.

From this time, the affair took an entirely different turn. The contest with the Origenists had hitherto been with Theophilus only a pretext, a means of taking vengeance on the monks; but now this object was dropped, and everything from henceforth made subservient to the main purpose, which was to avenge the imagined injury done to his honour by Chrysostom, and to bring about the ruin of the latter. For the accomplishment of this object means would not be wanting to a person of his character, and among the description of people by whom Chrysostom was surrounded.

He entered into correspondence with the enemies of Chrysostom among the more eminent clergy and laity of Constantinople; and he endeavoured to secure, as a useful instrument for effecting his designs, the bishop Epiphanius, a man whose venerable years and whose zeal for the orthodox faith gave him great influence among the bishops. Besides the circular letter which he sent to all the bishops of the East, calling upon them to join in the decisions of that Egyptian council against Origen, he sent a particular letter to Epiphanius, for the purpose of inflaming the zeal of the old man, which was so easily excited and so credulous in regard to such matters. It is true, he allowed nothing at all tending to the injury of Chrysostom to find entrance into this letter; but he called his attention to the danger which threatened the church, when monks burning with zeal to propagate this new heresy,* had betaken themselves to Constantinople, hoping to gain in addition to the older ones new proselytes to their impious doctrines.† He therefore urgently advised him to assemble

* Calumniatores veræ fidei novo pro hæresi furore bacchantes.

† Ut et novos, si quos valuerim, decipiant, et veteribus suæ impietatis sociis conjungantur.

the bishops of his island for the purpose of condemning Origen and the Origenistic heresies, to send in connection with them a synodal letter on this subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, and also to bring the bishops of Isauria and Pamphylia, as well as the other bishops in his vicinity, to the knowledge of this matter.

Epiphanius immediately complied with this invitation, and in the year 401 held the council for the condemnation of Origen; but Chrysostom showed no inclination whatever to take part in these measures of a blind heresy-making zeal. The cold reception which these communications met with from him was now eagerly seized upon by Theophilus as a means of rendering Chrysostom himself suspected of entertaining the Origenistic heresy. He sought to persuade Epiphanius that it was necessary to assemble a synod against the Origenistic heresy at Constantinople itself, where at all times many bishops were to be found together; and this synod was to be made the instrument of effecting the downfall of Chrysostom. Epiphanius came in the year 402, accompanied with bishops of his diocese, to Constantinople. Chrysostom paid him all due respect, and did everything in his power to alter his intentions; but Epiphanius refused to have any fellowship with him, unless he joined in the condemnatory sentence against Origen, and withdrew his protection from the monks. To neither of these demands could Chrysostom conscientiously yield. Epiphanius now proceeded still farther in his blind zeal, and allowed himself to be drawn into many violations of ecclesiastical law, to which in such cases he was wont to pay but little attention. But perhaps a conversation with some of the persecuted monks, besides other reasons, led him to surmise that the cause he was serving was not so very pure—and his own zeal, though utterly devoid of caution and prudence, was at least an honest one. He merely served as an unwitting tool to promote the designs of cunning, and hence he was now thrown into perplexity. He quitted Constantinople without waiting for the other bishops who were to assemble there on the like business, and in taking leave of the bishops who attended him to the place of embarkation, he said, "I leave to you the capital, the court, and hypocrisy."*

* Ἀφίημι ὑμῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ βασίλεια καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρισιν.

• Theophilus, after having satisfactorily prepared the way in common concert with the party hostile to Chrysostom, and with the empress, who had once more fallen out with her bishop, so that he might confidently hope for a happy issue to his designs, came to Constantinople in the year 403, to appear not, as was originally designed, in the character of a defendant, but as a judge. As the enthusiastic love of the great majority of the church for their bishop gave his enemies no security of being able to accomplish their insidious designs in the city itself, Theophilus assembled his synod in a neighbouring place, at a villa near Chalcedon, known by the name of the Oak.* This synod was composed of his own partisans among the bishops, some of whom had come with him, while others had been summoned by him, and others had met together on various matters of business at Constantinople.

At this synod no further mention whatever was made of the Origenistic heresies; but from the mouth of persons hostilely disposed to Chrysostom, as, for example, those worthless ecclesiastics and monks who had been chastised by him, charges were received against him, which had reference to facts of an entirely different nature. These charges were in part manifest inventions, or perversions of the truth, as we are compelled to believe, when we compare them with the known disposition and habits of the man; and in part they were based on allegations redounding rather to his honour than to his shame, and which, when thus employed against him, only showed the bad disposition of his opponents. Thus, for example, because he did not provide a splendid table, like other court bishops; because he continued to observe at Constantinople a retired and simple mode of life; and moreover, on account of his feeble state of health, was in the habit of eating alone,—his enemies were not ashamed to admit against him the charge of having, by his habits of solitary living, neglected the duty of hospitality, and of having led by himself a life of Cyclopean gluttony.† The most plausible ground of complaint may have been furnished by Chrysostom himself, when, in his zeal to preserve the strictness of church discipline, he failed of paying sufficient respect to the existing forms of eccle-

* Hence known by the name of the *σύνδος πρὸς τὴν ὄκυν*.

† "Ὅτι τὴν φιλοξενίαν ἀθετεῖ, μοναστικὰν ἐπιστηδεύων, ὅτι μόνος ἐσθιει. ἀσάτως ζῶν Κυκλώπων βίον. See the extract from the Acts in Photius. Cod. 59.

siastical law; and when he often allowed a pious indignation, to vent itself in too violent expressions. Only against several of the friends of Chrysostom some special use was still made of the charge of Origenistic heresy. While these things were transpiring at the council, Chrysostom found himself surrounded by forty respectable bishops, his friends from various countries of the East, who knew what a loss the church would suffer in him, and whom he was endeavouring to console and encourage. When the deputies of the council of the Oak presented themselves here for the purpose of citing him before their tribunal, *those friends* of Chrysostom did, indeed, pronounce the court to be an incompetent one, as they were authorized to do by all the forms of ecclesiastical law as it then was; but he declared himself ready, in the consciousness of his innocence, to appear before this assembly, as before any other in the world, provided only that four bishops, who were his avowed enemies,* should be excluded from the number of his judges. As this very just demand was not conceded to him, he declined, even after a third citation supported by an imperial notary, to obey the summons, and the synod, urged by a message of the emperor, who had become hostile to him through the influence of Eudoxia, to pass the definitive sentence pronounced upon him, since he had by his non-appearance declared himself to be guilty, the sentence of deposition. They were mean enough to add, that, as among the charges laid against Chrysostom was contained also the accusation of high treason (which probably referred to the charge of his having shown disrespect to the empress), and as it did not belong to the bishops to inquire into such matters, they left it for the emperor himself to take care that he should be removed, even if it required force, from the church, and, on account of the last-mentioned offence, be delivered over to punishment.

Yet partly religious considerations and partly the fear of movements among the people, who day and night surrounded the residence of the bishop and the church, prevented the emperor from having recourse at once to violence. And Chrysostom was resolved not to leave his office voluntarily; for he looked upon his connection with the flock entrusted to

* Even the unprejudiced Isidore of Pelusium (i. 152) says that Theophilus destroyed Chrysostom, *τίσασασι συνιργαίσι, ἢ μᾶλλον συναποστόλταις, ὀχυνεωθεῖς*.

him by the Lord, as one which could be dissolved only by a force to which he must be compelled to yield: Meantime he delivered to the assembled people a fiery discourse, full of the high-hearted courage of faith, yet not with all the self-control and prudence which would have been becoming, so that many an expression escaped him which might produce, in the inflammable minds of the Constantinopolitans, still greater excitement. But when this effect actually ensued, Chrysostom showed how foreign it was from his self-denying spirit to think of taking advantage of such an excited state of feeling, as he easily might have done, for his personal advantage; for as soon as he heard that it was actually intended to remove him by force, and he believed that he had done all that conscience required to prevent all tumults, he contrived on the third day at noon, without being observed by the multitude, to make good his retreat from the church, and was conveyed into exile. But a few days after he left Constantinople, a deputy from the empress came to him with a letter full of protestations, beseeching him to return; for an earthquake, which was usually interpreted as a token of the divine displeasure, and the indignation of the populace already excited by the overbearing triumph of his enemies, and which was thereby increased, had filled the empress with alarm and remorse of conscience.

Chrysostom was received back again by the church at Constantinople, with universal joy. He was unwilling, indeed, to re-enter upon the functions of his office until he had been formally justified and restored by a synod regularly assembled; but the affection of his flock compelled him at once to resume the episcopal chair, and to bestow on them from this the episcopal blessing. Yet the assembling of this synod was promised him, and he ceased not to insist upon its fulfilment, until his relations, which rested on so frail a foundation, again took an entirely different turn. It could not fail to happen that the vain and ambitious empress would soon be incensed and irritated again by the boldness of the man who rebuked crime without any fear of the consequences. This took place after he had enjoyed a tranquillity of only two months' duration. The occasion was as follows:—

In front of the palace where the imperial senate held their assemblies, a magnificent silver statue had been erected to the

empress Eudoxia. Its dedication was, as usual in such cases, accompanied with noisy and often indecent festivities, bordering on the customs of heathenism. The place where this occurred was so near to the great church, that the devotions of the assembly were unavoidably disturbed by it, and it happened, perhaps, on some festival day of the church. Our information respecting the course of this affair is not sufficiently authentic to enable us to determine with any certainty whether Chrysostom was misled by his natural warmth of temper to do many things contrary to the dictates of prudence; whether it was at the very outset, when flushed by the sense of wrong; or whether it was not until after he had tried other means with the empress in vain, that in a sermon he violently inveighed against these abuses. This being doubtless reported to the empress with an exaggerated colouring, she began to enter into new conspiracies with the enemies of Chrysostom, and the latter was now hurried along by his indignation at these new plots (if indeed his language has been reported to us in its original form) to begin a discourse perhaps at a festival commemorative of the martyrdom of John the Baptist, with the words, "Once more Herodias maddens—once more she dances, and once more demands the head of John."

When this was thus reported to the empress, she abandoned herself wholly to her resentment; and she might easily so represent the matter to the weak Arcadius, as to induce him to lend his hand in bringing about the destruction of Chrysostom. The synod which Theophilus led out from Alexandria, was employed as the instrument for this purpose. By its advice advantage was taken, without recurring to the earlier charges against Chrysostom, of a law issued by the council of Antioch, A.D. 341, but which was never put in force except at such times and to such extent as some momentary interest required,—the rule, namely, that a bishop who had been deposed by a synod, and who had been reinstated in office, not by another ecclesiastical court, but by the secular power, should remain for ever incapable of administering the functions of that office. Deposed from his episcopate, Chrysostom was conveyed into exile in the June of the year 404.

In a series of trials which conducted him towards a glorious end, he had every opportunity of manifesting the greatness,

power, and tranquillity of a soul wholly penetrated by the faith of the gospel. After a long and painful journey, in which he was still compelled to endure much shame and persecution from the angry hatred and fanaticism of his enemies, he arrived at the place of his banishment in the desolate city of Cucusus, on the borders of Armenia, Isaurea, and Cilicia. Here he had much to suffer from the rude climate and from repeated threatening invasions of Isaurean robbers; but instead of needing consolation himself, it was he whose words, full of confidence and of the energy of faith, gave heart and courage to his friends at Constantinople. From this place he guided the devoted flock whom he had been forced to leave. In this remote spot, he was the soul of the pious enterprises of his friends, as for example, of their efforts to spread the gospel among the Persians and the Goths. To promote this object, he was ready to take the first step towards reconciliation with bishop Maruthas of Mesopotamia, a man who had assisted to procure his condemnation; and even when Maruthas declined coming to any accommodation, he still invited his friends to do all in their power to sustain him. By the noble example of his charity, by his spiritual counsels and instructions, he was the means of great good to the whole district where he resided. Such a light could not be put under a bushel; it would shine, wherever it might be: and Chrysostom met with the fullest sympathy, especially from the Roman church, whose bishop, Innocent, declared very strongly in his favour. This served to rekindle the jealousy and resentment of his enemies; for they had reason to fear that his friends might eventually succeed in again bringing him back to Constantinople. This they were determined to prevent; they meant to place Chrysostom at last where he would be totally forgotten. In the summer of the year 407, he was conveyed to a new place of exile, at the very verge of the Roman empire, in the waste town of Pityus in Pontus, situated in the midst of barbarians. His body, exhausted by previous sufferings, sunk under the hardships of this long and difficult journey. He died on the way, near Comanum in Pontus, in the full and peaceful consciousness of his approaching end, and with bright visions into the life eternal. Those words of Job, which in his own seasons of quiet prosperity he so often impressed on the hearts of his hearers, and which in his times of trial he so

often presented to himself and to his friends as the richest source of consolation: Blessed be the Lord for all things, (ὁδοῖα τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἕνεκα!) were the last on his lips, worthily closing a life consecrated to God, and resigned to his will in all conflicts and sufferings.

But it was beyond the reach of any earthly power to extinguish the memory of this martyr from the minds of men who had felt the divine energy of his life and doctrines. There continued to exist at Constantinople a distinct and separate party of Johannites, who refused to recognize the validity of the act by which Chrysostom was deposed, and to acknowledge any one as their bishop who was appointed to succeed him. They held on Sundays and festival days their private meetings, which were conducted by clergymen who thought like themselves, and from these alone they would receive the sacraments. As among this party were to be found, also, many of the more excitable people of Constantinople, and every attempt to suppress them by force only rendered the opposition still more violent, many sanguinary tumults ensued. This schism spread more widely in the church; for other bishops and clergymen, who also protested against the injustice of the sentence pronounced on Chrysostom, and who continued to venerate his memory, came over to this party. They were sustained by the Roman church, which constantly asserted in the strongest terms the innocence of Chrysostom. His second successor, the bishop Atticus, took the first step towards a reconciliation, by introducing his name expressly into the church prayers offered in behalf of those bishops who had died in the orthodox faith. He made an agreement with the patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria, to grant a universal amnesty to all the adherents of Chrysostom among the clergy.* A greater schism of the church was by this means prevented: but at Constantinople, a small party of Johannites continued to hold their ground. The Patriarch Proclus first succeeded in putting a final end to the schism in that city. Having, in the year 438, prevailed upon the emperor Theodosius II.,† to allow the remains of Chrysostom to be brought back to Constantinople, and to be buried there with solemn pomp, he persuaded the remnant of the Johannites, appeased by the satis-

* See Socrat. VII. 25. Synes. ep. 66 ad Theophilum.

† Socrat. VII. 45.

faction thus done to the memory of their beloved bishop, to connect themselves once more with the ruling church.

For the rest, this passionate and violent mode of proceeding to suppress the Origenistic doctrines, was calculated much rather to excite than to check the zeal for these doctrines.* They who, like Theophilus, opposed the Origenistic heresy only as a convenient means of gratifying their private passions, were hence more tolerant in other cases where these passions were not interested. Theophilus himself gave a remarkable exemplification of this ten years later. The church at Ptolemais, the chief city of Pentapolis, laity and clergy, in the year 410, unanimously made choice of the philosopher Synesius of Cyrene to be their bishop—a man who had never left the silent retirement where he pursued his studies, except when his services were demanded for the good of his country. But the candid scholar frankly declared, and in such a way that the bishop Theophilus would be sure to hear of it, that his philosophical convictions did not on many points agree with the doctrines of the church; and among these differences he reckoned many things which were classed along with the Origenistic heresies, as for example, the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls, his different views of the resurrection, on which point he probably departed far more widely than Origen from the view taken by the church, inasmuch as he interpreted it as being but the symbol of a higher idea.† Synesius was willing, indeed, as he declared, to keep his peculiar philosophical convictions to himself; for he supposed, conformably with his Platonic mode of distinguishing between esoteric and exoteric religious doctrines, that the pure truth could never become the popular faith. But at the same time, he would never consent to teach anything himself which was at variance with his own convictions.‡ Despite of this open declaration of Synesius, Theophilus did not hesitate to follow the aged ecclesiastics in Ptolemais, who

* As is remarked by an eye-witness of a part of these events, Sulpicius Severus, Dialog. i. c. 3: *Sive illud error est, ut ego sentio, sive hæresis, ut putatur, non solum reprimi non potuit multis animadversionibus sacerdotum; sed nequaquam tam late se potuisset effundere, nisi contentione crevisset.*

† *ἵερὸν τι καὶ ἀπὸρρήτῳ.*

‡ *Οὐ στασιάσει μοι πρὸς τῇν γλώτταν ἢ γνῆμη.* See cp. 105, ed. Basil. p. 358.

said it was to be expected that the grace of the Holy Spirit would not leave this work incomplete, but would lead still farther into the knowledge of the truth the man whom he had led so far in the religious life. And he ordained him as bishop of this metropolis.

Not every ecclesiastic, however, who thus differed in his convictions from the doctrines of the ruling church, was as candid as Synesius. Notwithstanding all the efforts to preserve the churches against every deviation from the established articles of faith, it was still impossible to look into the inward principles of those to whom the offices of the church were confided.* At the same time, there had not as yet been expressed by any ecumenical council the opposition to the peculiar doctrines of Origen, and down to the times of the emperor Justinian no means had as yet been devised for preserving the church, by means of a prescribed confession of faith, to be acknowledged by ecclesiastics previous to their ordination, against every possible heretical tendency. Hence we find many proofs that Origenistic doctrines continued to be propagated in the East, among ecclesiastics and monks, even after this period;† and many were foolish enough to introduce into their sermons doctrinal opinions which had so little to do with the interests of faith.‡

* In consequence of the deplorably bad manner in which spiritual offices were often filled (see the sec. on the church constitution), it might happen, that in a time when so great stress was laid on formal orthodoxy, men attained to spiritual offices who had made themselves suspected of no heresy, because all matters of faith generally were considered of no consequence by them; but who went so far in their infidelity, which proceeded not from any sceptical bent of understanding, but from fleshly rudeness and utter immorality, that they in fact denied the immortality of the soul; and who still did not hesitate to perform all the spiritual functions, looking upon the whole in no other light than as a means of gain. See examples of such presbyters in Isidor. l. III. ep. 235 and 295.

† See *e. g.* Isidore, l. IV. ep. 163. Nili, ep. 188—190, II. 191.

‡ As for example, the Platonic-Origenistic doctrine of the pre-existence of souls;—that the Son was a higher intelligence created after the image of God. See the epistles of Nilus just referred to. The latter says to a preacher of this sort: *Τί ἂν διαφέρει καπνωδίας τὸ σὸν διάγγελμα, τὸ στασιοποιῶν τε καὶ ἀκερδές.* The abbot Isidore, a man distinguished for his practical bent of mind, shows this also. in his judgment of the controversy respecting the origin of souls. The advocates of the doctrine of pre-existence—he supposes—must agree with their opponents at least

Hence, under the reign of the emperor Justinian, there arose a new and violent strife betwixt the advocates and the opponents of the Origenistic doctrines among the monks in Palestine.* It now so happened, owing to circumstances which we have already explained, that the emperor Justinian was drawn to participate in these disputes; that he published an elaborate edict, with extracts from the writings of Origen, aimed at the condemnation of this great church-teacher, and his peculiar heretical doctrines, which were thus pointed out; and that, in consequence, a council which met at Constantinople, under the presidency of the Patriarch Mennas, in the year 541, confirmed this condemnation, and established fifteen canons in opposition to the Origenistic doctrines.

According to the old accounts which go back to the period in which these events took place, the fifth general council also, in the year 553 (see above, p. 250), renewed the condemnation of Origen and his doctrines; and among the canons with which the council concluded their labours in the eighth

on this point, that the moral conflict is required for the purification of the soul, for its return to its original state; and hence he concludes: Ἀφαιμῖναι τοῖνον τοῦ ζυγομαχιῶν περὶ τῶν ἀμφισβητησίμων, εἰς τὸ ὁμολογοῦμενον ἑαυτοῦς συνελάσσωμεν.

* See above. There were then forming among the Origenists two parties, respecting whose distinctive views we can only derive some probable conclusions from the names given to them, compared with the doctrines of Origen. One party (see Cyril Scythopolitan, vita S. Sabæ, s. 89, in Cotelier. monumenta ecclesiæ Græcæ, t. III.) were called *πρωτόκτισται* or *τετραδίται*; the other, *ισόχριστοι*. The former, as it may be conjectured, gave special prominence to the Origenistic doctrine respecting the pre-existing soul of Christ (see vol. II. p. 362). That soul with which the Logos had condescended to enter into union, they supposed to be exalted above all other created beings, to be the *πρῶτον* among the *κτιστοῖς*. Their opponents accused them of placing this soul, by their apotheosis, on a level with the three persons of the Trinity, and of introducing a *τέτρας* in place of a *τριάς*. The others, on the contrary, gave prominence to the Origenistic doctrine concerning an original equality, with only a numerical difference, of all created intelligences; and they looked upon it as the final end, that all should be once more restored back to that original unity; and hence they said, that as originally the souls which, by reason of their loyalty of will, had been received into indissoluble communion with the Logos, had nothing in preference over the others, who were intelligences of the same order, so all would ultimately attain to the same unity. Hence they were accused of placing themselves on a level with Christ. Against this last tenet the thirteenth among the canons against the Origenistic doctrines is directed.

session,* the twelfth canon, after condemning the heretics condemned by the older ecumenical councils, does actually treat of the condemnation of Origen. In this case, we must presume that the candour of the Origenistic party, who had been the authors of the whole controversy respecting the three chapters (see above, pp. 250-256), allowed themselves here, as on earlier occasions, to be driven by circumstances to the denial of their own expressed convictions. Yet the course of proceeding at this council, and the silence of other important documents of the same period, stand opposed to the supposition, that the council in question had any *particular* action on the subject of renewing the sentence of condemnation against Origen.† The confounding together of the synod held under Mennas with the fifth ecumenical council, which undeniably took place at an early period, as well as the wish to have a solemn condemnation of Origen from some general council, occasioned and promoted this transfer; and in case Origen was really mentioned, though but cursorily, along with the older heretics, by the fifth general council, this would furnish a convenient foothold for the above supposition. But, at the same time, it is not impossible that the name of Origen itself was but a later insertion. Along with Origen, the council in question is in fact said to have pronounced sentence of condemnation also on Didymus and Evagrius; and, in the age of Justinian, it might indeed very easily happen, that the anathema should be pronounced on names hitherto never mentioned by the majority but with reverence and respect. But the credibility of this account depends on the credibility of another, namely,—that the council in question was occupied particularly with Origen. At all events it had great influence in bringing about the later more general practice of treating Origen as a heretic, that a decree of this sort was ascribed to an ecumenical council.

* See Harduin. Concil. III. f. 198.

† Comp. Walch Geschichte der Ketzereien und Spaltungen, B. 8, S. 286, u. d. f.

APPENDIX TO THIS SECTION.

History of Sects

WE shall conclude the history of this period with some account of the minor sects which presented themselves in conflict with the dominant church, without having arisen, like those which have been mentioned, out of the doctrinal controversies. They were partly sects which sprung up afresh out of the germs existing already in the previous periods, and partly such as arose for the first time out of the peculiar state of the church in the present period.

Such phenomena of the Christian life are often very significant symptoms of disease in the life of the church: they betoken deeper wants of the Christian consciousness, which are seeking after their satisfaction. Opposite errors, or tendencies bordering on error, by which they are called forth, lend them a partial justification. As reactions of the Christian consciousness, although they may be in many ways disturbed reactions, they point to a purer reaction reserved for the future, which shall some time or other push its way victoriously through.

WE have already remarked, that worldly-minded bishops and ecclesiastics, instead of endeavouring to cherish and promote serious, vital Christianity, did everything in their power to suppress it, because it presented such a strong and to them vexatious contrast to their own mode of life. Serious and piously disposed laymen were persecuted by such clergymen, as dangerous censors of their conduct.* Often they were excommunicated from the church, or they separated of their own accord from such spiritual guides, because they could not believe it possible that men so polluted with every vice, should serve as instruments for the work of the Holy Spirit.† Others of like persuasion joined with them; and they became the founders of minor sects, in which, after the separation had once taken place, there arose, out of the opposition that had reference at first only to matters of practice, certain doctrinal

* Comp. also Isidor. l. V. ep. 131. *Αυτῶσι οἱ κυνῶν καὶ χοίρων βίον ἔχοντες κατὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν τὸν βίον.*

† That doubts had arisen, whether ecclesiastics, known to be vicious men, could administer the sacraments in a valid manner, is apparent from l. I. ep. 37; l. III. ep. 340.

differences also, which sometimes had no other ground than in the more sensuous mode of apprehension among uneducated laymen.

In this way arose the sect of the Audians.* Audius, or, as the name stood in his native Syrian, Udo,† was a layman, of a pious and austere life, who lived in Mesopotamia, near the beginning of the fourth century. He often objected to the worldly-minded ecclesiastics of this country their want of spirituality, particularly their devotion to gain, in seeking to enrich themselves by the practice of usury, and their gross immorality.‡ As his own strict and exemplary life probably gave him great influence among the laity, his reprimands of the clergy would be so much the more dangerous. He was persecuted by them, and at length excommunicated from the church. Others who were dissatisfied with the corrupt clergy, now joined with him, and they held separate meetings for common edification. The clergy then had recourse to the secular power, and Audius with his adherents were obliged to suffer many wrongs. This only roused them to more decided opposition to the dominant church, and the spread of the sect was promoted. Many discontented spirits united with Audius, and among these some bishops and ecclesiastics. He himself was now ordained as a bishop in his own sect, and all the others placed themselves in subordination to him. They refused to have spiritual fellowship with any that belonged to the dominant church. They even declined uniting with them in prayer. The antagonism which now existed between the Audians and the dominant church led their opponents, as well as themselves, to be more attentive to certain differences of opinion, and to lay greater stress upon those differences. Thus, to their opponents, the anthropomorphic mode of conception among the Audians, which, from the earlier times, still lingered in these districts among the more uncultivated, appeared an

* The most credible and distinct accounts of the origin and character of this sect is given by Epiphanius, since he appears here to have been less infected than others with the blind heresy-hunting zeal. He judges more mildly of this sect, partly because, owing to his whole bent of mind, he might not be inclined to attribute so much importance to the errors of sensuous anthropomorphism, partly because he was disposed to place a high value on ascetic austerities.

† See Ephraëm. Syr. Sermon. 24 adv. Hæres T. II. ed. Quirin. f. 493.

‡ Com. Theodoret. h. e. l. IV. c. 9.

important heresy; and many of their peculiar opinions, respecting which we have no exact information, may in like manner have had their ground in a deficiency of mental cultivation.* Furthermore, the Audians returned back to the ancient usage with regard to the determination of the time of the Easter festival, which had been discarded by the council of Nice; and they accused this council of having otherwise settled the time of the Easter festival, out of flattery to the Emperor Constantine, and so as to make it coincide with the day of his birth.

Audius, when now quite advanced in years, was banished to the country on the Black Sea (Scythia), where the Goths had at that time established themselves. He found followers among the Christians of this race, and he laboured also to convert the pagan Goths. The monastic life gained entrance among them by means of the Audians, who encouraged a rigidly ascetic tendency. This sect, which had not within it the basis of any long duration, and which had attained to a distinct subsistence only by means of the persecution waged against it, gradually disappeared towards the close of the fourth century.

As one extreme is ever wont to call forth another, so, as a matter of course, the one-sided doctrinal tendency, which placed the essence of Christianity in distinctions of the understanding, called forth the opposite extreme of a one-sided ethical tendency, which overlooked the connection between theory and practice, and the importance and significance of the doctrines of faith in their bearing on Christian life. While, through the strife of opposite systems of doctrine, many, after having abandoned themselves sometimes to this system and sometimes to that, became at last sceptical or perplexed with regard to Christian truth itself;† others, on the contrary, were by the same means led to believe that matters of doctrine gene-

* It is uncertain what truth lies at the bottom of the charge laid against them, (Theodoret. hist. eccles. IV. 9, and hæret. fab. IV. 10,) that they had asserted God was not the creator of fire and darkness, or that, in short, both were eternal. We are here reminded, indeed, of the view of the Jewish Theosophy, which is to be found in the Clementines, that fire is the element of the Evil One. Such views might easily have passed over to the Audians.

† See Gregor. Nazianz., Orat. I. f. 18: *Πρὸς πάντα λόγον ὁμοίως δυσχερύνουσι.*

rally were of no great importance, since, in fact, the attaining to any certainty on matters of this sort transcended the powers of human knowledge; that every thing depended on conduct, and all who led a good life might be saved, notwithstanding their differences of opinion in other respects. At Alexandria, where the speculative spirit on matters of doctrine chiefly prevailed, such an opposite tendency would also be most likely to spring up.* A certain Rhetorius, in the fourth century, is said to have created a party which professed this principle, and who were known afterwards under the name of *knowledge-haters* (γνωσίμαχοι).† But it may be a question, whether

* Thus Alexander of Lycopolis, in Egypt, opposes to the dogmatizing of the heretics the principle that the essence of Christianity, inasmuch as it is designed for the training of the people as well as others, consists in a popular system of ethics (παραγγέλματα παχύτιστα). See the introduction to his tract against the Manichæans in Combefi's bibliothecæ Græcorum patrum auctarium novissimum, Pars ii.

† Athanasius mentions first (l. i. contra Apollinarem, s. 6) a certain Rhetorius (Ρητόριος), whom he seems to accuse of the "godless" assertion, that all heretics were right according to their way. Next Philaster (Hæres. s. 91) has a special section relating to the Rhetorians: Allii sunt in Ægypto et Alexandria a Rhetorio quodam, qui omnes laudabat hæreses, dicens omnes bene sentire. But Philaster gives no further explanation of this opinion, and it is quite possible that the whole account of this sect had been only made out of an obscure passage of Athanasius. To Augustin, p. 72, it appeared incredible—as it would not fail to appear in case the theory was not any more distinctly set forth—that this person should have taught things so absurd. The theory is more distinctly set forth by the author of the Prædestinatus, h. 72, to wit, as follows: All worship God as well as they are able; we are bound to maintain Christian fellowship with all who call upon Christ as him who was born of the Virgin. Doubtless it may be, that this author had really heard of people who thought thus, and perhaps without sufficient reason, called them Rhetorians, tracing their origin, without cause, to the Rhetorius of whom he knew nothing except from Philaster. Those people of whom the Prædestinatus speaks might have in their minds the passage in Philip. i. 18. Chrysostom, in a special discourse (T. III. opp. f. 300), endeavours to guard this passage against any such application; but Chrysostom is here controverting not those who seriously maintained a doctrinal indifference of this sort, but those heretics, to whom their own peculiar scheme of faith seemed sufficiently important, and who were only desirous of establishing this principle for the catholic Christians, in order that they might assert their own claims to Christian toleration. Theodoret, on the other hand, where, in expounding this passage he says: Τούτο τινες τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ περὶ τῶν αἱρέσεων, ὑπελάφασιν εἰσῆσθαι, may actually have had in his mind such a class of *indifferentists*. Finally, John of Damascus (hæres. 88) mentions the γνωσί-

there was ever a regularly constituted sect professing such indifference to doctrines; whether the fact ever amounted to anything more than this, that individuals at different times and in different places were led by the same opposition and the same tendency of mind to entertain these views; of which individuals, the above-mentioned Rhetorius may have been one.*

The sects which arose from the intermingling of Oriental theosophy with the opinions of certain sects of Christian origin, the Gnostic, and particularly the Manichæan, which in the last times of the preceding period began to spread mightily in the Roman empire, continued to propagate themselves also in the present period; and they were probably invigorated by coming into fresh contact with the remains of old Oriental systems of religion on the borders of the Asiatic provinces of the Roman empire, and also from Persia, the native country of Manichæism, where the relationship of its doctrines with those of the dominant religion must have furthered its spread, until about the year 525, when its great influence, even in the royal family, excited a violent and bloody persecution against it.†

The law of Diocletian, of which we spoke on a former

μαχοι. Οἱ πάση γνώσει τῇ χριστιανισμοῦ ἀντιτίπτοντες, ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι περισσόν τι ποιοῦσιν οἱ γνώσεις τινὰς ἐκζητοῦντες ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ζητεῖ ὁ θεὸς παρὰ χριστιανοῦ, εἰ μὴ πράξεις καλὰς.

* Here would be the proper place to mention certain other minor sects little known to us, which seem to have sprung out of a religious eclecticism, if they did not belong rather to the general history of religion than to the history of Christian sects. The *Euphemites*, so called after the hymns addressed to the supremè God, the Almighty (whom alone they worshipped), which they chaunted together in their prayers,—a sect which seems to have arisen out of that spiritualized, refined polytheism, which was connected with the recognition of one absolute essence; the *Hypsiatarians* (the worshippers of the *θεὸς ὑψιστος*,) perhaps identical with the former, or perhaps differing from them by the mixing in of Jewish with pagan elements, known to us through the father of Gregory Nazianzen, who was at first a member of this sect (comp. the writings of Böhmer and Ullmann on this sect; the *Θεοσεβεῖς* in Phœnicia, who either sprung likewise out of that latter eclecticism, or were the offshoot of a still older form of religion, which subordinated Sabæism to Monotheism; the *Calicolæ*, predominantly of Jewish origin, originating perhaps from the proselytes of the gate. The rite of baptism among this last-mentioned sect may not have been the Christian ordinance, but may have sprung out of the Jewish baptism of the proselytes.

† See Theophanes Chronograph. and Cedren. ad h. a.

occasion (vol. ii. p. 195), would certainly tend to injure them. But when Constantine was endeavouring to put an end to the religious persecutions generally, which had arisen under Diocletian, and to introduce a universal religious toleration, he was naturally desirous of obtaining more exact information with regard to the character of the different and less known religious sects, and particularly of the Manichæans, respecting whom so many unfavourable reports were in circulation, in order to determine by the result of his enquiries what course of conduct he ought to pursue. He committed this investigation to an individual named Strategius, who, by his equal familiarity with the Latin and the Greek tongues, was admirably well fitted for such a business—the same who afterwards, under the name of Musonianus, rose to the dignity of a prætorian Præfect of the East.* The accounts which Constantine obtained in this way were probably favourable to the Manichæans, and he found nothing in their tenets to hinder him from extending his toleration to the Manichæan sect; but as the principles of toleration by which he was guided at first, gradually passed over to those of an opposite kind, the Manichæans, who were specially hated, became once more objects of persécution, even before any new laws had been enacted against them: The rhetorician Libanius interceded with the governor of Palestine in behalf of the Manichæans in that province, praying him to grant them security, and not suffer every man to insult them at pleasure. Without designating them by name, he yet sufficiently indicates whom he means, by mentioning them as those who worshipped the Sun, as the second divine being,† without offerings (since, according to the Manichæan idea, that one and the same soul is fettered in all animate bodies, such offerings could not properly be made); and who led a rigidly abstemious life, and counted death a gain.‡ He says of them, they are scattered over many countries of the earth, but are everywhere few in numbers; that they injured nobody, but were themselves obliged to suffer injuries from many.§ After

* See Ammian. Marcellin. hist. l. XV. c. 13.

† The Sun, in fact the manifesting, redeeming spirit of light, who is the medium of connection between the visible world and the supreme God. See vol. II. p. 177.

‡ It being a release of the soul of light from the bonds of the *ἄλγος*.

§ See ep. 1344.

the year 372 new laws appeared against the Manichæans, which grew more and more severe. Like other heretics they were deprived of their civil rights, and their assemblies were forbidden under severe penalties.

At Rome they had secretly propagated their sect down from more ancient times; and, moreover, they had congregated there in greater numbers, after being driven away from North Africa and other countries by the inroads of migratory tribes.* And here they sought to find admission into the church, but that very vigilant bishop, Leo the Great, with the aid of the civil magistracy, entered upon a rigid system of inquiry to find them out. He succeeded in discovering many, even of their presiding officers.† By means of these he ascertained the names of the other presiding officers of a sect every where dispersed and still closely connected in its dispersion; and he could now make use of this discovery for the purpose of assisting, by his correspondence with foreign bishops, in the detection of the Manichæans in every place.‡ Leo made it strictly incumbent on the members of his own community to inform him where Manichæans dwelt, where they taught, whom they visited, in what society they were wont to reside.§ Those of the

* Leo Sermo XV. Quos aliarum regionum perturbatio nobis intulit crebriores.

† Leo appeals before his own flock to the fact (p. 15), that the practice of dissolute conduct in their meetings had been absolutely proved by the confessions of Manichæans themselves; and, moreover, the law against the Manichæans, enacted in consequence of this investigation into the character of the sect, by Valentinian III., is evidence of the same thing. We are not warranted, it is true, to declare these charges directly to be false. In individual cases of exorcism, this combination of mysticism with dissoluteness of conduct may have existed, although altogether foreign from the original character of Manichæism. In an old form of condemnation against sects of this kind, which Muratori has published in his *anecdota* from the Ambrosian library, T. II. Mediolan. 1698, p. 212, a trace of the doctrine is certainly to be found, that the principle of several of the older Gnostic sects, according to which everything that relates to the body which sprung from the evil principle, is a matter of utter indifference to the soul, and that the former, therefore, might be given up, without injury to the soul, to every species of lust, was brought into vogue again by later sects. L. c.: Si quis peccatum carnis non dicit pertinere ad animam, anathema sit. Still we have not sufficient knowledge respecting the manner in which these investigations were conducted, to enable us to decide whether the result of them is deserving of confidence.

‡ See the chronicle of Prosper ad a. 443. § See Sermo XV. c. 5.

arrested Manichæans who would not consent to recant, were banished, and there appeared a new, severer law of the emperor Valentinian III. against this sect. Under the emperor Justinian, death was the established punishment for being a Manichæan.

Though a part of the Manichæans had at an earlier period been driven away by the political storms from the districts of North Africa, yet many still remained behind in this quarter of the world, which, from the fourth century, constituted the principal seat of Manichæanism; and the ignorance of the Vandal ecclesiastics made it easy for the Manichæans to gain proselytes among them. King Hunerich, who acceded to the government in 477, sought to display his zeal for the orthodox faith by persecuting them, and his anger was especially aroused at finding among them so many of the Vandal, Arian clergy. Some of the Manichæans he caused to die at the stake: others he shipped away out of the country.* In this way, again, many of them probably came into Europe, and these transmitted the doctrines of the sect, amidst the disturbances of these times, down to late generations.

The repeated persecutions prove how little could be effected by them. They rather served to promote the spread of the sect. The Manichæans gloried in martyrdom for the truth. Their presiding officers, the *elect*, compared themselves, persecuted, poor, and living in the most rigid abstinence, with the clergy of the catholic church, who lived an easy life in the abundance of earthly comforts; and they asserted that they might thus be known as the genuine disciples of Christ.† Being rigid ascetics, they might, too, often conceal themselves under the mask of monasticism, and indeed procure for themselves respect, while their heretical tendency remained undiscovered.‡ They might join in the divine service of the catho-

* See Victor Vitensis hist. persecut. Vandal. l. II. init.

† So says the Manichæan Faustus, comparing himself with the catholic clergy: *Vides pauperem, vides mitem, vides pacificum, puro corde, lugentem, esurientem, sitientem, persecutiones et odia sustinentem propter justitiam, et dubitas, utrum accipiam evangelium?* August. c. Faustum, l. V. c. 1.

‡ This is apparent from the law of the year 381. Cod. Theodos. l. XVI. Tit. 5, l. 7. *Nec se sub simulatione fallaciæ eorum scilicet nominum, quibus plerique, ut cognovimus, probatæ fidei et propositi castioris dici ac signari volent, maligna fraude defendant, cum præsertim nonnulli ex*

lic churches, since there were no other means of detecting them except by their scrupling, on account of their ascetic principles, to partake of the consecrated wine. Many among them might adopt the current church terminology, giving it another and a mystical sense, after the manner of Agapius,* who demonstrated his orthodoxy, even in an encounter with Eunomius. Faustus of Mileve in Numidia† successfully employed his skilful eloquence and brilliant wit, which was not accompanied, however, with solid judgment, for the extension of the sect. He, as well as other Manichæans, knew how to promote his cause by taking advantage of the weak spots which the catholic church exposed in its matters of faith and practice. The mysterious element in the symbols and doctrines of the Manichæans; the promise they held out of a special solution of difficulties by means of a loftier wisdom, in opposition to the blind and implicit belief which they censured in the dominant church; the close fraternization in which they lived with each other; all this was attractive to a great many. Men eagerly enrolled themselves in the class of *auditores*, longing after the higher mysteries in which they were to be initiated as the *elect*.

Many new combinations of Oriental theosophy with Christianity were also formed, either proceeding from Manichæism or independent of it. Thus, for example, a certain Aristocritus wrote a work under the title of *Θεοσοφία*, in which he sought to show that Judaism, Hellenism, and Christianity, were but different forms of one and the same revelation of the Divine, thus taking his stand in opposition to Mani.‡

A new offshoot of this theosophic tendency made its appear-

his Eucratis, Apotactis, Hydroparastatis, vel Saccophoros nominari se volent et varietate nominum diversorum velut religiosæ professionis officia mentiantur. Many other indications are to be found of the spread of Manichæism among the monks. See *c. g.* Theodoret. *hist. religios.* T. III. p. 1146. Εὐχῆται ἐν μοναχικῇ προσήματι τὰ Μανιχαίων νοσούντες. Isidor. *Pelus.* I. 52.

* Concerning his writings, see Phot. *cod.* 179.

† From his work in defence of the Manichæan doctrines against the catholic church, Augustin has preserved important fragments in his reply.

‡ *Ἀριστοκρίτου βίβλος, ἐν ἣ πιεῖται δεικνῦναι τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμὸν καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνισμὸν καὶ τὸν Χριστιανισμὸν ἐν εἶναι καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δόγμα καὶ κατέσται καὶ τοῦ μανέντος.* See the anathemas in Jac. Tollii *insignia itinerarii Italici*, p. 142.

ance in Spain towards the close of the fourth century, in the sect of the Priscillianists, a sect which professed many tenets closely related to Manichæanism, but not to such a degree, however, as that their origin may be traced with certainty to the Manichæans. The first seed of their doctrines came from a man of Memphis by the name of Marcus. He travelled to Spain, and is said to have disclosed his doctrines to Elpidius, a rhetorician, and to his wife Agape. From them it is said, these doctrines were communicated to Priscillian, a respectable and wealthy man in Spain, respected for his pious and austere life, who had perhaps for a long time before already busied himself a good deal with matters of this sort,* and by embodying them in a systematic form and giving them spread, he became the founder of the sect. The eloquence of Priscillian, and his ascetic austerities, which acquired for him the more respect as contrasted with the worldly life of many ecclesiastics, procured for him numerous followers, and among these some bishops, as, for instance, Instantius and Salvianus. The bishop Hyginus of Cordova first came out against them, and by him the bishop Idacius of Emerita (Merida) was instigated to persecute the sect. But, by his rough and violent mode of proceeding, the latter rather promoted the spread of the sect, and Hyginus himself became afterwards dissatisfied with the manner in which the Priscillianists were treated, and turned round to be their protector. Upon this, an important synod assembled at Cæsaraugusta (Saragossa) in the year 380, which pronounced sentence of condemnation on the Priscillianists, and sought to take measures to prevent the further spread of the sect. They committed to the bishop Ithacius of Sossoba the business of seeing that their decrees were put into execution. They could not have made a worse choice than they did in this man, who was a mere voluptuary, and utterly destitute of all sense for spiritual things.†

Excluded from the church, the followers of Priscillian now took more thorough measures for establishing their party; and they had the boldness to make Priscillian himself bishop of Avilla. But Idacius and Ithacius, conformably with their

* *Multa lectione eruditus.* Sulpic. Severi hist. sacr. l. II. c. 46.

† So he is described by Sulpicius Severus, hist. sacr. l. II. c. 50. *Nihil pensi, nihil sancti habuisse. Fuit enim audax, loquax, impudens, sump-tuosus, ventri et gulæ plurimum impertiens.*

character, sought by various artifices to make use of the secular power against the Priscillianists, and thus to crush them.* They actually succeeded in procuring an imperial rescript whereby Priscillian and all his adherents were condemned to exile. The latter hoped, through the influence of the two most eminent bishops of the West, to procure a rescindment of this decision: and the leaders of the sect repaired to the bishops Damasus of Rome, and Ambrose of Milan, for the purpose of vindicating themselves before these prelates; but in this, of course, they could not possibly succeed. They succeeded better in an attempt to bribe, with the money of Priscillian, a civil officer of rank, Macedonius, the master of offices (*magister officiorum*), and through his influence it was brought about, that the first rescript was revoked, and the order given that the churches of which the Priscillianists had been deprived, should be restored back to them.

Ithacius did not cease persecuting them; and being complained of himself as a disturber of the peace, he fled to Gaul. Already, it is said, was he conducted back to Spain, and there arraigned before the tribunal, when a great political change gave a different turn to the whole affair. The news came, that Maximus, who had proclaimed himself Cæsar in Britain, would soon arrive at Triers. There Ithacius waited for him, and on his arrival placed in his hands a formal accusation against Priscillian and his followers. The new emperor received the complaint, and perhaps in the outset was only intending to show his zeal for pure doctrine, since he glories in this, in his letter to the Roman bishop Siricius. He treated the affair as one purely ecclesiastical; he ordered that all who were suspected of participating in the spread of these false doctrines, should appear before a synod to be assembled at Burdelaga (*Bordeaux*) in the year 384. Instantius and Priscillian were the first to appear before it. After the former had been deposed from the episcopal dignity, because what he said in defence of himself was not found to be satisfactory, Priscillian forestalled the sentence which he might expect, by appealing to the emperor, by which infatuated step he prepared the way for his own destruction. The bishops, partly from their own weakness, partly out of hostility to Priscillian, forebore to

* Sulpicius Severus pronounces this *parum sana consilia*.

protest against this proceeding, by which, contrary to the existing theory of rights in the Western church, a purely spiritual offence was brought and tried before a secular tribunal.

Accordingly, all that were complained of, or suspected, were cited before the emperor's tribunal.‡ Idacius and Ithacius appeared as the accusers; and Ithacius, it is said, was for fixing the suspicion of Priscillianism on all who led a strict and serious Christian life, for which he had no liking himself; all who were much given to the study of the Bible, or who often fasted.* A truly pious man, however, who then resided at Triers, declared very strongly against this *unspiritual* mode of proceeding. It was the bishop Martin of Tours.†

He declared it to be an unheard-of thing that an ecclesiastical matter should be judged by a secular court on principles of the civil law. He entreated Maximus to spare the lives of the unfortunate men; it was enough that, by the decision of the bishops they had been declared false teachers, and deprived of their churches. As long as Martin was present the trial was actually delayed, and before his departure the emperor promised him there should be no shedding of blood; but when Martin was gone, the emperor, through the influence of two bishops, Magnus and Rufus, was led to change his mind, being the more readily disposed to follow the advice of these two bishops, who recommended severity, because the property of the rich Priscillian and of his followers excited his cupidity.‡ He

* The words of Sulpicius Severus: *Hic stultitiæ eo usque processerat, ut omnes etiam sanctos viros, quibus aut studium inerat lectionis aut propositum erat certare jejuniis, tanquam Priscilliani socios aut discipulos in crimen arcesseret.*

† Although descended from heathen parents, yet he had already when a child received the seeds of Christianity into his heart. Against his own will he became a soldier, and showed the evidence of Christian piety in the military service. Then he became a monk, finally, a bishop. The veneration of his period denominated him a worker of miracles. See his biography by Sulpicius Severus, one of his enthusiastic admirers, who had known him personally, but losing himself in exaggerations, has given us too little of the genuinely historical and characteristic facts relating to his life. See also the dialogue of Sulpicius.

‡ Sulpicius Severus, who would fain excuse Maximus, says (*Dialog. III., c. 9*) that most people at that time suspected the emperor of covetousness, *si quidem in bona eorum inhiaverat*; and the pagan Pacatus Drepanius says in his panegyric on the emperor Theodosius the Great, *c. 29*, concerning the cause of Maximus' inclination in favour of these

committed the trial of the cause to a severe judge, the præfect Eud dius. Priscillian was condemned not only as a false teacher, but also as a violator of the laws. He was accused of disseminating doctrines, the tendency of which was to countenance and encourage unnatural lusts. In the secret assemblies of the sect, it was asserted, abominations of this kind had actually taken place. Maximus appealed, in his letter to the Roman bishop Siricius, to the fact that the crimes of Priscillian had been disclosed by his own confession;* but it is easy to see that everything depends on the question how this confession was drawn forth. An admission extorted by the rack, as this most probably was,† wants the force of evidence; and the very circumstance that the emperor felt it necessary to justify his conduct before the Roman bishop may betray the consciousness of his guilt.

The result of this judicial process was, that Priscillian and several of his most important adherents were executed with the sword.‡ Others, after the confiscation of their goods, were banished to the island of Syllina (Scilly).

There was one individual, however, of the bishops assembled at Trier, namely, Theognist, who declared in the most emphatic language, without fear of the emperor's anger, against this whole proceeding, and he renounced the fellowship of all those who had taken any part in it. The voice of this individual by itself was of little avail; but he was now to be sustained by a powerful ally. The bishop Martin was on the point of returning to Trier for the purpose of imploring the mercy of the emperor in behalf of numbers who had been engaged or

bishops, whom he calls *nominibus antistites, revera autem satellites atque carnifices*: a quibus tot simul vota veniebant avaro divitum bona.

* In this letter, first published by Cardinal Baronius from the Vatican library, Maximus says: *Cæterum quid adhuc proxime proditum sit, Manichæos sceleris admittere, non argumentis, neque suspicionibus dubiis vel incertis, sed ipsorum confessione inter judicia prolatis, malo quod ex gestis ipsis tua sanctitas, quam ex nostro ore cognoscat; quia hujusmodi non modo facta turpia, verum etiam fæda dictu, proloqui sine rubore non possumus.*

† Pacatus Drepanius mentions expressly, in connection with this investigation, the *gemitus et tormenta miserorum*.

‡ Among the persons executed was also the noble and rich widow Euchrotia, of whom Pacatus Drepanius says (l. c.): *Exprobabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio et diligentius culta divinitas. Quid hoc majus peterat intendere accusator sacerdos?*

implicated in the recent political strifes. The bishops, who heard of this, dreaded his great influence. Moved by their representations Maximus caused Martin to be informed before he came into the city, that he could not be permitted to enter unless he promised to keep peace with the bishops. Martin answered he would come with the peace of Christ.

When he arrived at Triers he attached himself to Theognist; and fruitless were all the efforts of Maximus to make him satisfied with the conduct of the bishops—fruitless all his representations to bring about a reconciliation betwixt him and the party of Ithacius. Finally he dismissed him in anger.

Meantime the emperor had resolved to send to Spain a military commission with unlimited powers, for the purpose of continuing the trials and the punishment of the Priscillianists. Had this purpose been executed, others doubtless besides the Priscillianists, whose property was coveted, or who might be looked upon as belonging to the sect merely on account of the cast of their countenance or the ascetic dress,* would have fallen victims to the persecution. Martin, ever since his first interview with Maximus, had been labouring to persuade him that he ought not to execute this decree; but the latter had given only evasive replies. At length Martin heard all at once that tribunes, commissioned with full powers, had been actually sent to Spain. He hurried immediately, though it was night, to the palace, and promised the emperor that he would admit the bishops to church-fellowship if the emperor would recal the tribunes; and by this compliance he rescued, for the time being, several unhappy creatures from ruin.

Though many, influenced by the blind zeal against heretics, and by the perverse principle of Augustin, carried out to the extreme that it was right to bring back the erring to the truth and to salvation, by the fear of bodily sufferings,† were induced to approve of those oppressive mea-

* Sulpic. Sever. Dialog. l. III. c. 11, cum quis pallore potius aut veste quam fide hæreticus æstimaretur.

† Leo the Great, taking for granted, indeed, that Priscillian set forth doctrines totally destructive of good morals, says of this mode of proceeding against heretics, ep. 15, ad Turribium: Profuît diu ista districtio ecclesiasticæ lenitati, quæ, etsi sacerdotali contenta iudicio eruentas refugit ultiones, severis tamen Christianorum principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad spiritale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale supplicium.

tures, or at least, to wink at them; yet influential voices declared against them. When, at a later period, Ambrose of Milan came to Triers on business of the young emperor, Valentinian II., he was not deterred by any fear of the displeasure of Maximus from refusing the fellowship of the church to those bishops who had taken part in those proceedings;* and he compared them with the Pharisees, who questioned Christ respecting the punishment which, according to the civil laws, was due to the woman taken in adultery.† Siricius, bishop of Rome, took the same ground with Ambrose.‡ Ithacius was afterwards deposed from his episcopal office, and the schism lasted for some time between these two parties of bishops, the party that approved, and those who condemned, the proceedings against the Priscillianists.

For the rest, the death of Priscillian and his friends could not effect the suppression of the sect; on the contrary, it served to give it a new access of enthusiasm.§ Priscillian, and many of those who had been executed with him, were adored by the sect as martyrs.

As to the doctrines of Priscillian, we find, so far as we can gain any knowledge of them from the meagre accounts of

* As Ambrose himself relates, ep. 24 ad Valentinianum; Me abstinere ab iis qui aliquos, devios licet a fide, ad necem petebat.

† Ep. 26 ad Irenæum: Quid enim aliud isti dicunt, quam dicebant Judæi, reos criminum legibus esse publicis puniendos, et ideo accusari eos etiam a sacerdotibus in publicis judiciis oportuisse, quos adcerunt secundum leges oportuisse puniri.

‡ We must infer this from the vi. canon of the Council of Turin. Harduin. I. f. 959, where the decisions of Ambrose and of the bishop of Rome are placed together as one and the same.

§ With what suspicion Christians, and especially monks, coming from Spain, were regarded in the beginning of the fifth century (since, in fact, Priscillianism often put on the garb of Monachism), from the dread of the Priscillian heresy, which was there so widely diffused, is seen in the instance of the monk Bacchiarius, who, in his tract de fide, and in his exhortation to a fallen monk, (ad Januarium de reparatione lapsi,) discovers, as a teacher of faith and morals, a moderate and gentle spirit. Driven, perhaps by the political disturbances, from Spain, he betook himself to some other district of the West, where he might hope to enjoy more tranquillity; whether to Rome, as we might infer from the account of Genadius, c. 24, remains uncertain, as this account contains several other statements which are manifestly incorrect. As it seems, no one was willing, however, to receive him in any of the cloisters, and the bishops also hesitated to grant him the fellowship of the church because they suspected him, on account of the country he came from, of heresy. This led him to draw up in his own defence his confession of faith, which was

their adversaries,* that Dualism and the emanation theory were combined together in them—elements related to Gnosticism and Manichæism. He supposed a kingdom of light, which developed itself in manifold gradations, by emanation from the original source, and opposed to this a kingdom of darkness or chaos, out of which, as an emanation from it, proceeded the powers of darkness, at the head of whom stands Satan.† The souls which emanated from the divine essence are sent forth to combat the powers of darkness; they vow in the presence of God to contend with firmness and constancy, and the angels stimulate them with exhortations. They descend through the seven heavens, perhaps the kingdoms of the seven star-spirits,‡ forming the boundary betwixt the kingdoms of light and of darkness, in order to attack this latter; and probably it was Priscillian's notion that from each of these sidereal regions the souls appropriated and brought along with them a correspondent sidereal vehicle.§ But now the powers of darkness succeed in drawing down the souls to themselves, and of enchaining them in bodies.|| This result, however, is not a mere

first published by Muratori in the second volume of the above-cited collection of ἀνεκδότα from the Ambrosian library, and again by Galland. bibl. patr. T. IX. The manner, then, in which he here justifies antithetically his orthodoxy, particularly in respect to the doctrines of the Trinity, the humanity of Christ, the resurrection, the origin of the soul, in respect to marriage, the ascetic life and the canon of the sacred scriptures, shows clearly that it was against the suspicion of being tainted with the Priscillian doctrines, so widely diffused in his own country, he had chiefly to defend himself.

* Especially the Commonitorium of Orosius to Augustin, (Augustin. hæres. 70,) and the answer of bishop Leo the Great to Turribius, bishop of Asturica, (Astorga,) in which he for the most part joins in accepting the report of the latter respecting the doctrines of this sect, in order to their confutation.

† Satanam ex Chao et tenebris emersisse. Leo ad Turrib. c. vi.

‡ Comp. the doctrine of the Ophites.

§ If we consider, however, that Priscillian used the Ascensio Isaiaë, which has come to our knowledge in the Ethiopic translation, (ed. Lawrence. Oxon. 1819,) it becomes perhaps, more probable that by the seven heavens he understood seven graduated classes of the higher world of spirits following one after the other—seven stages of the higher world of emanation, according to the Cabbalistic theology. It may be questioned, also, whether the sidereal world, according to his theory, belongs wholly to the kingdom of evil, or rather answers to the Gnostic kingdom of the Demiurge.

|| According to Leo's representation, c. 10, Priscillian supposed an earlier guilt preceding birth; but the representations of Orosius and of

accident, but the powers of darkness are destined thus to subserve the purposes of the divine wisdom in bringing about the destruction of their own kingdom. The heavenly souls were destined to destroy the kingdom of darkness in its own seat, and this was actually brought about by the redemption.*

Over against the twelve sidereal powers, the twelve signs of the Zodiac, to which man is supposed to be related and subjected by means of his *body* (whose several parts and members Priscillian assigned to the different constellations of the Zodiac), he placed the twelve heavenly powers, represented under the name of the twelve patriarchs, to whom the *souls* of men are supposed to be related, and under whose guidance they stand. Hence man, representing in his soul and body the universe in miniature, unites in himself the higher and lower worlds, heaven and earth.† By virtue of the inherent dependence of the body, in which the soul has been imprisoned by the powers of darkness, man continues to be subject to the influences of the stars until the soul, which is related to God, obtains, through its fellowship with that higher world from which it had sprung, power to deliver itself from those lower influences. In order to the deliverance of these souls the Redeemer appeared on earth. It cannot be determined with certainty what Priscillian thought of the divine and the human natures of Christ. It is certain that he entertained Monarchian notions respecting the relation of the Son of God to the Trinity, as well as respecting the Trinity generally. According to his theory of the body, as being the seat and origin of evil; of birth as a work of the

Augustin, which we have followed, manifestly bear more of the character of originality, and expressions from a letter of Priscillian confirm this representation. If we must suppose that Leo's exposition must harmonize with that of Augustin, the harmony, in the sense of Priscillian, might be sought for simply in this, that the submitting to be overcome by the powers of darkness was represented as a contraction of guilt, which Leo was at fault in not only understanding in the right way in conformity with Priscillian's train of ideas.

* Here we recognise Priscillian's general principle, which is to be found also in the Manichaean system; *arte, non potentia Dei, agi omnia bona in hoc mundo*. The kingdom of light, by its victorious wisdom, forces the princes of darkness, on the very spot where they seem to be insolent and to conquer, to subserve its purposes and prepare the way for their own downfall.

† Priscillian's words, in a letter, are: *Hæc prima sapientia est, in animarum typis divinarum virtutum intelligere naturas et corporis dispositionem, in qua obligatum cælum videtur et terra.*

powers of darkness ; he could not admit the fact of the birth of Christ with a true human body of earthly stuff. If, then, the testimony of Leo is to be relied on,* that the Priscillianists attributed the predicate "only begotten" to the Saviour only in the sense that he alone was born of a Virgin, yet this certainly is not to be so understood as if Priscillian had wholly adopted the church notions respecting the birth of Christ. He might be the more induced to dwell on the predicate in this sense, if he reckoned among the extraordinary facts connected with Christ's birth his having brought with him a body of ethereal mould ; and thus the being born denoted, in his case, something entirely different from what it does in the case of other men. From the antithetic dogmas, however, which the council of Toledo, in the year 400, opposed to the Priscillianists, it is evident that the latter represented Christ as one who was incapable of being born (*innascibilis*), and maintained that Christ's divine and corporeal nature were one and the same. This seems to involve the Manichæan form of conception ;—the one divine light-nature exhibited itself to the eye of sense under the semblance merely of an object of sense. Leo says, moreover, that they could not join with the church in celebrating the festival of Christmas, because they held the Docetic notions respecting Christ's appearance on earth. If Priscillian gave particular prominence to the suffering of Christ, in accomplishing the work of redemption, this circumstance would, it is true, seem not quite consistent with the Docetic views ; but the way in which he expresses himself on this point admits of being explained also, even if we suppose that, like Mani, he attributed to the sufferings of Christ only a symbolical meaning.† As the twelve signs of the Zodiac have influence on the birth of the outward man, so the twelve celestial powers, opposed to them, influence the new birth, whereby the inner man is to be restored to fellowship with the divine substance from which it emanated.‡ What is affirmed of Christ, that he was born of a woman, but conceived of the Holy Ghost,§ the Priscillianists

* L. c. c. III.

† Christ by his sufferings, said Priscillian, annulled the bond, Col. ii. 14, by virtue of which the soul was held imprisoned in the body by the powers of darkness, and was made subject to the sidereal influences.

‡ Leo c. 13. *Duodécim virtutes, quæ reformationem hominis interioris operantur, ut in eam substantiam de qua prodiit, reformetur.*

§ Leo c. 9. *Filios promissionis ex mulieribus quidem natos ; sed ex spiritu sancto conceptos.*

applied to all the sons of the promise. It may be questioned, however, whether they understood this of the birth, so far as man's inner essence is derived from God, or of the new birth as contrasted with the natural. The Priscillianists, as may be gathered from what they affirmed concerning the Patriarchs, acknowledged the authority of the Old Testament. They appropriated it to their purpose by resorting to the allegorical method of interpretation; but it still might be the case that in so doing they distinguished the God of the Old Testament from the God of the Gospel.* Besides the canonical scriptures of the Old and New Testament, however, they made use of several apocryphal writings, as, for example, the hymn of thanks sung by Christ on his last visit to the mount of Olives (Matth. xxvi. 30), which they said was handed down among the initiated alone.†

The moral system of the Priscillianists was, as their doctrine concerning the origin of the body required, rigidly ascetic. It enjoined austerities of all sorts, and, in particular, celibacy. The charges laid against them of dissolute conduct are, to say the least, not sufficiently well authenticated; but it must be owned, that, in common with most of the theosophic sects who were in the habit of distinguishing an esoteric and an exoteric doctrine, they were extremely loose in their principles of veracity. They affirmed that a falsehood might be allowed for a holy end—for example, to promote the spread of their own mysteries; and that it was right to conceal from the multitude, by affecting to agree with them in their fleshly notions, that which they were as yet incapable of understanding. There was no obligation to speak out the whole truth, except to the enlightened; that is, to the members of the sect: and to give some shadow of foundation for this view respecting the limit to the obligation of truthfulness, they made use of the passage in Ephes. iv. 25, distorted to their own meaning. Their bishop Dictinnius, who, at the council of Toledo, in the year 400, came over to the Catholic church, had written a work, entitled “The Scales,”‡ in which these principles were expounded and defended. But it is plain, from this very principle of theirs, that their own sayings respecting the character of the sect and its doctrines, as well as the declarations in the recantations of its members

* As is implied in the genuine antithetic proposition of the council of Toledo.

† See Augustin. ep. 237 ad Ceretium.

‡ Libra.

who returned back to the Catholic church, deserve little confidence.

Hence, many Catholic ecclesiastics were of the opinion that, in order to draw from the Priscillianists a true account of the subject matter of their doctrines, it was right to adopt the same method of dissimulation. But Augustin composed an excellent treatise for the express purpose of exposing the immorality of this method, and of setting forth the absolute universality of the obligation to veracity.*

By following out this principle, the Priscillianists found it, of course, comparatively easy to propagate their sect, in spite of all the persecutions; and as accessory to this purpose came in also the political agitations, occasioned by the migration of wandering tribes over Spain, amidst which movements the oversight of the church could not be so constantly and strictly maintained. The council of Braga, in the year 563, found it necessary to enact new laws with a view to the detection and suppression of the Priscillianists; and from this circumstance we see how long they were enabled to maintain themselves, and how easily† they might scatter the seeds of their doctrines far down into the succeeding periods.

Although these later influences of the old Oriental sects, in their relation to the development of this particular period, may appear unimportant, yet they were propagated to the following centuries, and proved an important means in the hand of God, whereby a lively opposition was first aroused to the adulteration of the gospel by the intrusion of human dogmas, and to the slavery of the spirit which thence resulted; and whereby the laity was brought back to a consciousness of the rights pertaining to the universal priestly office of Christians at large, and to the pure well-spring of the truth in the divine word.

* His work *de mendacio ad Consentium*.

† *Concilium Bracaraense i.*

GENERAL INDEX

TO VOLS. III. AND IV.

- Abasgians, conversion of the, iii. 164
 Abdas of Susa, iii. 156
 Abyssinian church, iii. 168-171
 Acacius of Amida, iii. 159
 Acacius of Berea, iv. 146
 Acacius of Cæsarea, iv. 70
 Acacius of Constantinople, iv. 235, 238
 Acacius of Melitene, iv. 154
 Acephaloi, iv. 239
 Acœmetes, iii. 342
 Acta Pilati, iii. 6
 Adelprians, iii. 341
 Adrametum, monks of, iv. 373
 Edesius, iii. 169
 Aërius, iii. 486, 487
 Aëtius, iv. 70
 Agapæ, iii. 461
 Agapetus of Rome, iii. 212; iv. 246
 Agapius, iv. 499
 Agnoëtism, iv. 112
 Alaric, iii. 182
 Alexander of Alexandria, iii. 311.
 His participation in the Arian controversy, iv. 10-15
 Alexander of Antioch, iv. 82
 Alexander of Constantinople, iv. 38
 Alexander of Hierapolis, iv. 180, 185
 Alexander of Lycopolis, iv. 486
 Alexandria, synod at (A.D. 362), iv. 104
 Alexandrian school. Interpretation of scripture and inspiration, iii. 497. Points in which it differed generally from the Antiochian school, iii. 498. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 120
 Ambrose. Election to the episcopate, iii. 101, 102, 111, 200, 204. Incident with Theodosius, iii. 255. Priscillian, iv. 493. Active in behalf of Monachism, iii. 367. Against Jovinian, iii. 390. Concerning fasts on the Sabbath, iii. 423. Composer of Church hymns, iii. 451. Anthropology, iv. 287. Intermediate state for unbaptized children, iv. 434. Lord's supper, iii. 468; iv. 436
 Ammianus Marcellinus, iii. 45, 47, 58, 71, 192
 Amphilocheius of Iconium. Against images, iii. 412. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 86
 Anachorets. See Monachism.
 Anastasius, emperor, iv. 239
 Anastasius, presbyter of Nestorius, iv. 126
 Anastasius of Rome, iv. 462
 Anatolius of Constantinople, iv. 221
 Anatolius of Rome, iv. 256
 Ancyra, council of (A.D. 314), iii. 209, 227, 254. Synod of (A.D. 358), iv. 66
 Andreas of Samosata, iv. 177
 Annianus, iv. 334
 Anthimus, iv. 244
 Anthropology, iv. 278, 410
 Anthropomorphites, iv. 463
 Anthusa, iii. 321; iv. 467
 Ἀντιστήσις τῶν ὀνομάτων in Apollinaris, controverted by Theodore, iv. 119; in the Alexandrian school, iv. 119
 Antiochian school, iii. 212. Inter-

- prælation of scripture, iii. 497.
 Points in which it differed generally from the Alexandrian school, iii. 498. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 108
 Antioch, council of (A.D. 341), iii. 218; iv. 476. Council of (A.D. 345), iv. 45
 Anthony, iii. 323-333
 Aphthartodocetism, iv. 268
 Apocatastasis, iv. 445
 Apollinaris of Antioch, iii. 82
 Apollinaris of Laodicea, iii. 82.
 Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 98-106. Controverted by Theodore of Mopsuestia, iv. 108
 Arabia, the gospel in, iii. 166, 171
 Arcadius, iii. 111, 116; iv. 476
 Ardaschad, synod at, iii. 161
 Arian controversy, iv. 1-28
 Ariminum, council of, iv. 68
 Arius, iv. 1, 9. Doctrine, iv. 3-9.
 Participation in the Arian controversy, iv. 9-27. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 84. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 93.
 Arles, council of (A.D. 314), iii. 268.
 On the time of the paschal feast, iii. 427. Council of (A.D. 355), iv. 53. Council of (A.D. 475), iv. 401
 Armenia, Christianity in, iii. 160, 161. Monophysites in, iv. 271
 Arnobius the younger, iv. 400
 Ashebethos, iii. 167
 Asterius of Amasea, iii. 69. On images, iii. 408, 411
 Asylum, law of, iii. 206
 Athanasius, iii. 180
 Athanasius, life and labours, iv. 30-84. Julian and Athanasius on
 * persecution, iii. 47. On Origen, iv. 449. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 84. Doctrine of creation, iv. 92. Against Apollinarianism, iv. 104. Lord's supper, iv. 439
 Atticus of Constantinople, iii. 159; iv. 478
 Audius and the Audians, iv. 484
 Augustin. Development of his Christian life and doctrines, iii. 501.
 His mother, iii. 321. Platonism, iii. 144-146. De civ. Dei, iii. 132, 132. De fide et operibus, iii. 142, 143. Concerning Rome, iii. 237. On councils, iii. 249; Church discipline, iii. 255. Efforts with the Donatists, iii. 280-307. In behalf of the Anchorites, iii. 352. Monachism, de opere Monachorum, iii. 368. Against Jovinian, iii. 392. De bono conjugali, iii. 392. Reading of the Bible, iii. 397. Sign of the cross, iii. 406. Fasting on the Sabbath, iii. 423. Fasts, iii. 431. Festival of the New Year, iii. 446. As a preacher, iii. 448. Frequent celebration of the Lord's supper, iii. 466. Idea of sacrifice in the supper, iii. 471. Adoration of saints, iii. 473. The Church-father of the West, iii. 501-510. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 87. Anthropology, iv. 288. De gestis Pelagii, iv. 314. On the civil power applied against Julian, iv. 429. Appeal to the Christian consciousness, iv. 330. Antagonist of the Pelagian doctrines, iv. 337-360. De gratia et libero arbitrio, and de correptione et gratia, iv. 369, 379. De prædestinatione sanctorum, and de dono perseverantiæ, against the Semi-Pelagians, iv. 370, 381. Retractiones, opus imp., and death, iv. 385. Idea of the sacraments, iv. 424. Opposed to the limbus infantium, iv. 435. On faith in the case of infant baptism, iv. 435. Doctrine of the Lord's supper, iv. 439. Purgatory, iv. 443. De mendacio ad consentium, iv. 502. Refuses gifts to the churches, iii. 193. Authority of the Roman Church, iii. 234
 Auxentius, bishop of the Goths. See Appendix.
 Avitus, monk, iii. 361
 Babæus, iv. 270

- Babylas the martyr, iii. 89
 Bacharius, iv. 497
 Bacurius, iii. 163
 Baptism, iv. 428. Euchites, iii. 343.
 Administration of, iii. 452, 455.
 Doctrine of, iv. 428
 Barbatianus, iii. 391
 Bar Sudaili, iv. 271
 Barsumas, abbot, iv. 199
 Barsumas of Nisibis, iv. 270
 Basiliscus, iii. 191; iv. 234
 Basil of Ancyra, iv. 66
 Basil of Casarea, iv. 77. Friend of
 Gregory Nazianzen, iv. 100. At
 Athens, iii. 212. Election to the
 episcopate, iii. 217. Julian, iii.
 82. Basilias, iii. 194. Interces-
 sion, iii. 199. In favour of the
 Cenobite life, iii. 349. Rules for
 monks, iii. 355. Doctrine of the
 Holy Spirit, iv. 86. Chrestomathy
 from Origen, iv. 449
 Benedict of Nursia, iii. 370-375
 Benjamin the deacon, iii. 157
 Bible, reading of the, iii. 396. Read-
 ing of the Bible before the church
 assemblies, iii. 400. Study of the
 Bible among the Goths, iii. 182.
 Among the Antiochians, iii. 212
 Bishop. See Church constitution.
 Bonifacius of Rome, iii. 247
 Boniface II. of Rome, iv. 408
 Bonosus opposed to the worship of
 Mary, iii. 483
 Bordeaux, synod at (A. D. 384), iv.
 493
 Braga, council of (A.D. 561), iii. 451;
 iv. 502
 Cæcilian, iii. 264, 266
 Cæsar of Arles, iii. 370; iv. 405
 Calliana (Calcutta), iii. 165
 Candidian, iv. 153-168
 Carthage, council of (A.D. 401), iii.
 225, 425; (A.D. 403), iii. 281; (A.D.
 404), iii. 282; (A.D. 407, 413), iii.
 247
 Cassian, John, iii. 350, 369; iv. 375
 Cassiodorus, iii. 212; iv. 308
 Catechumens, iii. 455
 Celibacy, iii. 207
 Cenobites, iii. 350
 Chalcedon, delegates at, iv. 171. Ecu-
 menical council of, iv. 247
 Character indelebilis, iv. 426
 Chor bishops, iii. 226
 Christ, doctrine concerning the person
 of, iv. 92-268
 Christmas, festival of, iii. 437-444
 Chrysaphius, iv. 208, 221
 Chrysostom, iv. 467-474. Anthusa,
 iii. 321. Labours in behalf of the
 Goths, iii. 181. Eutropius, iii. 205.
 Presbyters, iii. 220. Stagnius, iii.
 337. Anachorets, iii. 349. Mona-
 chism, iii. 378. On the right wor-
 ship of God, iii. 394. Prayer, iii.
 395. Reading of the Bible, iii. 396.
 Sign of the cross, iii. 406. Images,
 iii. 408, 411. Celebration of festi-
 vals, iii. 419. Fasts, iii. 429. Christ-
 mas, iii. 437. As a preacher, iii.
 450. Infant baptism, iii. 455.
 Lord's supper, iii. 466. Sacrifice
 in the Lord's supper, iii. 471. Pil-
 grimages, iii. 484. Inspiration and
 interpretation of scripture, iii. 499.
 Anthropology, iv. 417. Baptism,
 iv. 429. Doctrine of the Lord's
 supper, iv. 436
 Church, invisible and visible — fail-
 ure of distinguishing between—in
 the Donatist controversy, iii. 287.
 Conception of the—by Tichonius,
 iii. 296. Augustin approximating
 to the true conception of, iii. 300.
 Conception of the invisible church
 by Jovinian, iii. 389
 Church and state, iii. 184-207
 Church buildings, iii. 400-404
 Church constitution, iii. 184-253
 Church discipline, iii. 253-257
 Church psalmody, iii. 450-451
 Church schisms, iii. 257-316
 Circumcelliones, iii. 272
 Cœlestin of Rome, iii. 174. In the
 Nestorian controversy, iv. 143, 188.
 In the Pelagian controversy, iv.
 386
 Cœlestius, iv. 308. Doctrine of bap-
 tism, iv. 432
 Communion, daily, iii. 465

- Confirmation, iii. 219, 459
 Consilia evangelica disputed by Jo-
 vinian, iii. 382. How considered
 by Pelagius, iv. 322. By Julian,
 iv. 375
 Constans, iji. 43. Donatists, iii. 274.
 Arian controversy, and Athanasius;
 iv. 48
 Constantia, sister of Constantine, iii.
 22, 407; iv. 28
 Constantine the Great, iii. 7-42, 147,
 187, 189, 191, 195. Donatists,
 iii. 273. Letter to Antony, iii.
 331. Arian controversy, iv. 17-
 38. Manichæans, iv. 487
 Constantine the younger, iii. 43; iv.
 61
 Constantinople, second ecumenical
 council of (A.D. 331), iv. 81.
 Condemnation of Apollinaris, iv.
 106. Council of (A.D. 360), iv.
 70. Synod at (A.D. 448), iv. 204.
 Synod under Mennas at (A.D. 536),
 iv. 246. Council of (A.D. 551).
 iv. 262. Fifth ecumenical council
 at (A.D. 553), iv. 264
 Constantius, iii. 43-51. Arian con-
 troversies, iv. 40
 Constantius Chlorus, iii. 7
 Cosmas Indicopleustes, iii. 165, 440
 Councils, iii. 247-253
 Councils, general, iii. 247-252
 Creationism, iv. 352
 Cresconius, iii. 280, 281
 Crispus, iii. 41
 Cross, sign of the, iii. 405
 Cultus, Christian, iii. 393
 Cyrill of Alexandria. Representative
 of the Alexandrian school, iv. 133.
 In the Nestorian controversy, iv.
 137-196
 Cyrill of Jerusalem, iii. 139, 399,
 457, 465; iv. 93. Baptism, iv.
 428. Lord's supper, iv. 436.
 a. 16
 Dalmatius, iv. 164, 165
 Damasus of Rome, iii. 101, 210,
 218; iv. 454, 493
 Deacons. Deaconesses, iii. 220-224
 Demetrius Chytas, iii. 45
 Demophilus of Constantinople, iv. 80
 Delymus, iii. 212; iv. 449
 Dictinnius, Libri, iv. 501
 Diodore of Tarsus, iv. 192, 269
 Dionysius the Areopagite, writings
 ascribed to, iii. 497; iv. 275
 Dionysius Exiguus. Collection of
 decretals, iii. 252. On the time of
 the Easter festival, iii. 428
 Dioscurus, iv. 198, 219, 229
 Diospolis, synod at (A.D. 415); iv.
 315
 Docetism. Hilary. See Appendix.
 Priscillian, iv. 500
 Domitian of Ancyra, iv. 253
 Domnus of Antioch, iv. 204, 216
 Donatists, iii. 258-308. Church dis-
 cipline, iii. 291
 Donatus of Casæ Nigræ, iii. 264, 268,
 270
 Donatus Magnus, iii. 270
 Dsunovas, iii. 170
 Easter, time of, iii. 427
 Edessa, school at, iv. 271
 Elesbaan, iii. 170
 Elvira, council of (A.D. 305), iii.
 202, 468.
 Ephesus, third ecumenical council at,
 iv. 152. Second general council
 (A.D. 449), or Robber synod, iv.
 211-220
 Epiphanius, iii. 225. Against images,
 iii. 414; iv. 450, 458
 Epiphany, feast of, iii. 419, 435. As
 a season for baptism, iii. 460.
 Episcopal power, growth of, iii. 214,
 220
 Eschatology, iv. 442-446
 Euchites, iii. 341-349
 Eudocia, iv. 142, 209, 221, 232
 Eudoxia, iii. 116; iv. 469
 Eudoxius of Antioch, later of Con-
 stantinople, iv. 70, 73
 Eugenius, iii. 111
 Eulogius of Cæsarea, iv. 314
 Eunapius, iii. 132
 Eunomius, iv. 58. An Aristotelian,
 iii. 496. Doctrine of the Holy
 Spirit, iv. 85. Doctrine concern-
 ing the person of Christ, iv. 93
 Euoptius of Ptolemais, iv. 158

Euphemites, iv. 487
 Euphemius of Constantinople, iv. 240.
 Eusebius of Cæsarea. • Participation in the Arian controversy, iv. 15. Against images, iii. 409. Doctrine of the Lord's supper, iv. 442. Panegyric on Constantine, iii. 8, 30, 34, 36
 Eusebius of Dorylenum, iv. 204, 208
 Eusebius of Nicomedia. Participa- in the Arian controversy, iv. 19-29. Baptizes Constantine, iii. 48
 Eusebius of Persian Armenia, iii. 158
 Eusebius the presbyter, iii. 313
 Eusebius of Vercelli, iii. 214; iv. 53
 Eustathius of Antioch, and the Eusta- thians, iii. 341; iv. 73
 Eustathius of Sebaste, and the Eusta- thians, iii. 341
 Euthymius, monk, iii. 168; iv. 465
 Eutropius, iii. 206; iv. 468
 Eutyches, iv. 200, 207
 Eutychius of Constantinople, iv. 264
 Evagrius, the Origenist, iv. 464, 482
 Exarchs, iii. 231
 Facundus of Hermiane. Respecting councils, iii. 251. In the contro- versy of the three chapters, iv. 253, 255, 259
 Fasir and Axid, iii. 279
 Fasts, iii. 429. Jovinian on, iii. 382. Aërius opposed to laws regulating, iii. 486
 Fasting, seasons of, iii. 429-432
 Fausta the empress, iii. 41
 Faustus of Mileve, iii. 503; iv. 491
 Faustus of Rhegium, iii. 370; iv. 401. Controversy about his work De Gratia, iv. 406
 Felix of Aptunga, iii. 286
 Festivals, Christian, iii. 427-447
 Flavian of Antioch, iii. 202, 346
 Flavian of Constantinople, iv. 204, 210, 219
 Fortunius, iii. 282.
 Fraus pia. Euchites, iii. 345. Pris- cillianists, iv. 501
 Frumentius, iii. 169
 Fulgentius Ferrandus, iv. 257
 Fulgentius of Ruspe, iv. 406

Galerius, edict of, iii. 1
 Gallus, Julian's brother, iii. 53
 Gangra, council of, iii. 209, 378
 Gaudentius of Brescia, iv. 509
 Gaudentius of Thamugade, iii. 287
 Gelasius, iv. 348. Lord's supper, iv. 438
 General councils, iii. 247-252
 Gennadius, presbyter at Marseilles, on Augustin, iv. 404
 Gennadius of Lower Hermupolis, iv. 237
 Georgius of Alexandria, iii. 49, 85; iv. 57
 Georgius of Laodicea, iv. 66
 Gnosimachi, iv. 486
 Goths, Christianity among the, iii. 177-183; iv. 529. Arians, iv. 91: also in the Appendix.
 Grace. See Pelagian controversies.
 Gratian, iii. 100, 315
 Great Week, the, iii. 433
 Gregory of Alexandria, iv. 48
 Gregory of Nazianzus, iii. 215, 217; iv. 77, 78. Mother, iii. 320. On councils, iii. 249. Infant baptism, iii. 453. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 83. Doctrine concern- ing the person of Christ, iv. 96. Against Apollinarianism, iv. 105. Doctrine of baptism, iv. 428. In- termediate state for unbaptized children, iv. 434. Lord's supper, iv. 441. Chrestomathy from Origen, iv. 449
 Gregory of Nazianzus, the father, iii. 84, 320; iv. 487
 Gregory of Nyssa. On baptism, iii. 454. Influence on the council of Con- stantinople, iv. 83. His relations with Origen, iv. 441. Pilgrimages, iii. 484. On the rage for discuss- ing doctrines at Constantinople, iv. 41. On the iii: experience in opposition to Eunomius, iv. 61. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 84. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 96. Lord's supper, iv. 438. On the final restoration, iv. 445

- Gregory Photistes, iii. 160
 Gregory, the enlightener, iii. 160
 Gyrovagi, iii. 350, 373

 Helena, mother of Constantine, iii. 7, 484
 Helladius of Tarsus, iv. 183
 Helvidius, against the worship of Mary, iii. 483
 Heron, monk, iii. 339
 Heros of Arles, iv. 314
 Hilarion, monk, iii. 333
 Hilarius, iii. 223
 Hilarus, deacon at Rome, iv. 219
 Hilary of Arles, iii. 245
 Hilary, the friend of Prosper, iv. 385
 Hilary of Poitiers. Against the founding of Church and State, iii. 47. Author of church hymns, iii. 451. In defence of Athanasius, iv. 53. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, iv. 84. Soul and body of Christ, iv. 96. Anthropology, iv. 280. Lord's supper, iv. 436
 Hipporegius, council of (A.D. 393), iii. 233
 Homerites, Christianity among the, iii. 166
 Honorius, iii. 113, 284
 Hormisdas, iii. 157
 Hormisdas of Rome, iv. 406
 Hosius of Cordova, iii. 41, 218; iv. 57
 Hyginus of Cordova, iv. 492
 Hypsistarians, iv. 487

 Ibas of Edessa, iv. 284. Letter of, condemned, iv. 265
 Iberians, conversion of the, iii. 162-164
 Idacius of Emerita, iv. 492
 Images, iii. 409-418
 India, the gospel in, iii. 164, 165
 Infant baptism, iii. 453-460
 Innocent of Rome. On the Roman primacy, iii. 241. On fasting on the Sabbath, iii. 424. In the Pelagian controversies, iv. 317.
 Inspiration, doctrine of, iii. 498
 Instantius, iv. 492
 Intercessions of bishops, iii. 199-203
 Irenæus, Comes, iv. 154, 164
 Ireland, Christianity in, iii. 172-177
 Isidore of Pelusium, iii. 190, 356, 359, 401, 451; iv. 135. Anthropology, iv. 423. Baptism, iv. 430
 Isidore, presbyter of Theophilus of Alexandria, iv. 465
 Ithacius of Sossuba, iv. 492.

 Jacob of Edessa and the Jacobites, iv. 272
 Jerome, iv. 451. Active in support of monasticism, iii. 367. Against Jovinian, iii. 391. On fasting on the Sabbath, iii. 423. Against the theatrical mode of church psalmody, iii. 452. On the Lord's supper, iii. 467. Against Vigilantius, and in favour of the worship of the saints, iii. 479. Against Helvidius, iii. 483. Pilgrimages, iii. 484. Interpretation of scripture and inspiration, iii. 498. Pelagian controversies, iv. 311, 409. On Origen, iv. 454.
 Jerusalem, synod of (A.D. 415), iv. 312
 Jews. Favoured by Julian, iii. 71. Persecution of the Christians on the part of the, iii. 148
 Jezdegerdes, iii. 156; iv. 527
 Johannites, iv. 478
 John of Antioch, 182. In the Nestorian controversy, iv. 147-163
 John, Comes sacrarum, iv. 172
 John of Jerusalem, iv. 457
 John Philoponus, iv. 274
 John, Syncellus of Cyrill, iv. 166
 John Talaya, iv. 237
 Joseph, Patriarch of Armenia, iii. 161
 Jovian, iii. 95; iv. 76
 Jovinian, iii. 381-392
 Judaism, Julian's views of. See Appendix. Its relation to Christianity and to paganism. See Appendix, 49-51, 101
 Julian, emperor, iii. 49-94, 120-127, 278
 Julian of Eclanum. Participation

- in the Pelagian controversies, iv. 327. Advocate of the Pelagian doctrines, iv. 356, 367. Doctrine of baptism, iv. 432
- Julius of Rome, iii. 244; iv. 44
- Justin, iv. 243
- Justina, iv. 93
- Justinian, iii. 119; iv. 244, 489
- Juvenalis of Jerusalem, iv. 156, 212, 232
- Laity, participation of the, in ecclesiastical elections, iii. 216
- Lampon, iv. 139
- Laodicea, council of, iii. 227, 459.
On the festival of Sunday, iii. 422.
On church psalmody, iii. 451
- Lazarus of Aix, iv. 314
- Lazians, conversion of the, iii. 163
- Leo the Great, iii. 147, 242, 245, 443; iv. 210. On the Robber's synod, and the Chalcedonian council, iv. 218. Was he the author of the book *de vocatione gentium*? iv. 392; Manichaeans, iv. 489. Priscillianists, 496
- Leo, Emperor, iv. 233
- Leontius of Neapolis, in defence of images, iii. 416-418
- Leporius, iv. 332
- Lerins, cloister of, iii. 370; iv. 387, 401
- Libanius, iii. 35, 63-72
- Liberius of Rome, iii. 313, 437; iv. 56
- Licinius, iii. 16-26
- Life, Christian, iii. 316-393
- Lord's supper, celebration of the, iii. 463-470. Doctrine of the, iv. 435-442
- Lucian, iii. 127
- Lucidus, iv. 401
- Lucifer of Cagliari, iv. 53, 75
- Luciferites, iv. 76
- Lucilla, iii. 264
- Macarius of Egypt, iv. 460
- Macarius of Palestine, iii. 339
- Macarius Politicus, iv. 460
- Macedonius of Constantinople (A.D. 360), iv. 70
- Macedonius of Constantinople (after A.D. 510), iv. 240
- Macedonius, monk, iii. 353
- Majorinus, iii. 267, 270
- Male (Malabar), iii. 165
- Manichaeans, iv. 487. Exclude wine in the sacrament of the supper, iii. 468
- Marcellinus, iii. 284
- Marcellus of Ancyra, iv. 50. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 94. Opponent of Origen, iv. 448
- Marcellus of Apamea, iii. 110
- Marcian, emperor, iv. 221
- Marcian, monk, iii. 361
- Marcianists, iii. 341
- Marriage. Despised by the Eustathians, iii. 347. Jovinian's views concerning, iii. 382. Considered a sacrament by Augustin, iv. 428
- Maris of Chalcedon, iii. 84
- Marius Mercator, iv. 409-422
- Mark of Arethusa, iii. 72, 86
- Mark of Memphis, iv. 492
- Mark, monk. Sole trust in the Redeemer, iii. 361
- Martin of Tours. Active in defence of monasticism, iii. 367. Priscillianists, iv. 494
- Maruthas of Tagrit, iii. 156; iv. 477
- Mary, worship of, iii. 483. Mary the *Georézis*. See Nestorian controversy.
- Maternus, iii. 48
- Maxentius, iii. 10
- Maximinus, iii. 2-6, 20
- Maximus, abbot, iv. 193
- Maximus, emperor, iv. 493
- Melchiades (Miltiades) of Rome, iii. 268
- Meletius of Lycopolis, and the Meletian schism in Egypt, iii. 308-318; iv. 33
- Meletian schism at Antioch, iv. 75-81
- Meletius of Mopsuestia, iv. 186
- Meletius of Sebaste, iv. 74
- Mennon of Ephesus, iv. 154
- Mennas, iv. 250, 255, 489
- Mensurius, iii. 259, 263

- Meropius, iii. 168
 Messalian, iii. 341
 Metropolitan constitution, iii. 229
 Miesrob, iii. 160
 Milan, synod at, iv. 53
 Mihr-Nerseh, proclamation of, iii. 161
 Miracles. Views of Augustin concerning. See Appendix.
 Monachism, iii. 322-393
 Monica, iii. 321
 Monophysites beyond the Roman empire, iv. 271
 Monophysite controversies, iv. 231
 Moses of Chorene, iii. 163

 Nectarius of Constantinople, iii. 257
 Neo Cæsarea, council of (A.D. 314), iii. 209, 455
 Neo-Platonism, iii. 51, 53, 118, 144
 Nestorians in Persia, iv. 269
 Nestorian schools, iii. 212
 Nestorian controversy, iv. 122, 570
 Nestorius, iv. 122-172, 187-191, Anthropology and participation in the Pelagian controversy, iv. 421
 New Year, festival of the, iii. 445-447
 Nicæ in Thrace, iv. 69
 Nice, council of (first ecumenical), iv. 18-27; iii. 214, 217, 222. Decision with respect to the Meletian schism, iii. 311. On the time of the celebration of the passover, iii. 428. Intended council of (A.D. 451), iv. 366
 Nilus, iii. 338. Against indolence and too long prayer, iii. 342. On the monastic life, iii. 354, 355, 376. On images, iii. 413. Lord's supper, iv. 436
 Niobites, iv. 273
 Nisibis, iii. 212; iv. 271
 Nitria, cloisters of, iii. 358
 Nonna, iii. 320
 North-African church. Its free spirit, iii. 247; iv. 323, 429
 Nuns, cloisters for, iii. 326, 336

 Oak, synod of the, iv. 473
 Offering, notion of, connected with the sacrament of the supper, iii. 471
 Optatus of Mileve, iii. 236, 264
 Orange, council of (A.D. 441), iii. 222; (A.D. 529), iv. 407
 Oriental church. As distinguished from the Western church, iii. 490. Anthropology of the, iv. 409-422
 Origen, compared with Augustin, iii. 497, 501
 Origenists and the Origenistic controversy, iv. 248, 447, 489
 Original sin (inherited sin). See Pelagian controversy.
 Orosius, iii. 124. In the Pelagian controversy, iv. 312

 Pachomius, labours of, iii. 334. Opponent of Origen, iv. 449
 Paganism, iii. 99
 Palladius the archdeacon, iii. 174
 Palladius, iii. 336; iv. 469
 Pambo, abbot, iii. 451
 Papacy, iii. 238-246
 Paphuntius, iii. 209
 Parsism, iii. 149
 Passover, feast of—the time; iii. 427, 428
 Patriarchs, iii. 231
 Patriarchal constitution, iii. 231-234
 Patrick, St. iii. 172-177
 Paulinus of Antioch, iv. 75.
 Paulinus, deacon, from Milan, iv. 310
 Paulus Catena, iii. 45
 Paul the hermit, iii. 323
 Paul of Emesa, iv. 175
 Pelagian controversy, iv. 298-372
 Pelagius, life of, iv. 299. Doctrine of human nature of Christ, iv. 298. In the Pelagian controversy, iv. 311. Opposed to the doctrine of Purgatory, iv. 443
 Pelagius, Roman archdeacon, iv. 249, 256
 Persian church, iii. 148-160; iv. 269, 271
 Peter's primacy, iii. 236
 Peter the clothier, iv. 240
 Peter of Alexandria, iii. 308, 311
 Peter of Jerusalem, iv. 249
 Peter Mongus, iv. 238

- Petilian, iii. 286, 297, 301
 Philippopolis, council of, A.D. 347, iv. 46
 Philoxenos, iv. 240. Against images, iii. 418
 Photinus of Sirmium, iv. 50. Doctrine concerning the person of Christ, iv. 94
 Pilgrimages, iii. 484
 Platonism, as a form of church doctrine, iii. 496
 Pontianus, iv. 256
 Porphyry of Gaza, iii. 116
 Possessor, iv. 406
 Prayer, doctrine concerning. Eucharites, iii. 344. Chrysostom on this point, iii. 395. Antiochian church—prayer for catechumens iii. 456
 Predestinations, iv. 395
 Predestination, doctrine of, iv. 370
 Presbyters, iii. 219
 Priesthood, false idea of the, iii. 207
 Primasius of Carthage, iv. 262
 Priscillian and the Priscillianists, iv. 491
 Proarsius, iii. 81
 Proclus of Constantinople, iv. 129, 193
 Proclus the Neo-Platonist, iii. 118
 Prosper of Aquitania, iv. 380, 388
 Proterius of Alexandria, iv. 233
 Prudentius, iii. 115
 Psalmody, iii. 450
 Ptolemy, monk, iii. 340
 Pulcheria, iv. 141, 171, 221
 Purgatory and purgatorial fire, iv. 443
 Purpurius, iii. 262
 Rabulas of Edessa, iv. 192, 270
 Redemption, doctrine of. Different views of the Eastern and Western churches, iv. 359, 443. As held by Augustin, iv. 359. By Pelagius, iv. 307. By Theodore of Mopsuestia, iv. 446. By Priscillian, iv. 499
 Relics, worship of, iii. 264, 479
 Reparatus of Carthage, iv. 262
 Reginus of Constantia, iv. 158
 Rhetorius, iv. 486
 Romanus, iii. 371
 Rome, iii. 235-237. Authority of the Roman church, iii. 234
 Rufinus, iv. 447-462
 Sabas, iv. 533
 Sabbath, celebration of the, iii. 421-424
 Sacraments, administration of the, iii. 453-470. Doctrine concerning the, iv. 423.
 Sapor II., iii. 147
 Sarabaites, iii. 350
 Saragossa, synod at (A.D. 380) iv. 492
 Sardica, council of, iii. 214, 227, 244; iv. 46. Canons of this council confounded with those of the council of Nice, iii. 245
 Sarmatio, iii. 391
 Scripture, interpretation of, iii. 497
 Sects, history of the, iv. 483
 Secundus of Ptolemais, iv. 26
 Secundus of Tigisis, iii. 261
 Seleucia, in Isauria, council of, iv. 68
 Semi-Arianism, iv. 20
 Semi-Pelagianism, iv. 375
 Seneca, a bishop of Italy, iv. 335
 Serapion, monk, iv. 463
 Sermon, the, iii. 448
 Sermon on the mount, iv. 304
 Severus, poem of, iii. 16
 Severus, Monophysite, iv. 241
 Silverius of Rome, iv. 247
 Simeon of Seleucia, iii. 152
 Simeon the Stylite, iii. 167, 363
 Simplicianus of Milan, iii. 81
 Simplicius, iii. 134, 136; iv. 511
 Sirmium, council of (A.D. 351), iv. 52. Synod at (A.D. 357), iv. 64
 Siricius of Rome, iii. 210, 390, 460; iv. 46, 2, 495
 Sixtus of Rome, iv. 373
 Socrates on the observance of feasts, iii. 420
 State and church, iii. 124. Donatus, iii. 276. Intermingling of the state, iii. 490.
 Stephanus Gobarus, iv. 275
 Strategius, iii. 20; iv. 488
 Study of the ancients, iii. 212; iv. 467
 Sunday, observance of, iii. 424

- Symmachus, *in* 101, 137
 Synodus, *in* 145, 245, 257, 405, *iv.*
 479. On monasticism, *in* 360.
 Platonism, *in* 496
 Taprobane (Ceylon) *in* 165
 Tertullian, *in* 222
 Thalassius of Casarea, *iv.* 212
 Themistius, *in* 47, 97, 99
 Theodori, *iv.* 246
 Theodorus Asceticus, *iv.* 249
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, *in* 149
 Doctrine of imputation, *in* 499,
 Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, *iv.* 89
 Doctrine concerning the person of
 Christ, *iv.* 108 In answer to
 Cyrill, *iv.* 149 Cyrill intends his
 condemnation, *iv.* 192 Council
iv. 254 Participation in the
 Pelagian controversy, *iv.* 409
 Anthropology, *iv.* 411 Doctrin
 concerning baptism, *iv.* 430 Apo-
 catastasis, *iv.* 441
 Theoloret, *in* 134 Mother, *in* 321.
 Rome, *in* 235. Monasticism, *in*
 354 Worship of saints, *in* 473
 Interpretation of scripture, *in* 497
 Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, *iv.* 90
 Deposed, *iv.* 217 His writings
 condemned, *iv.* 232 Sacrament of
 the Lord's supper, *iv.* 457
 Theodoretus of Cyros, *in* 158
 Theodosius the Great, *in* 100-111,
 256, *iv.* 89
 Theodosius II., *in* 100, 246, *iv.* 152,
 479
 Theodosius the Monk, *iv.* 252
 Theognis of Nice, *iv.* 27, 29
 Theognist, *iv.* 495
 Theology, in the more restricted sense,
iv. 1, 92.
 Theological education, *in* 211-214
 Theonas of Marmarica, *iv.* 26
 Theophilus of Alexandria, *in* 401.
 In the Origenic controversy, *iv.*
 462, 465.
 Theophilus the Arabian, or Indian,
in 164, 169
 Theophilus, bishop of the Goths, *in.*
 177
 Thienen, synod at (A.D. 536), *iv.* 271
 Tichonius, *in.* 29
 Timotheus Aflurus, *iv.* 234
 Timotheus Sidophaciolus, *iv.* 234
 Titus of Bostra, *in* 83
 Toledo, council of (A.D. 400), *in.*
 468, *iv.* 301 Council of (A.D.
 589), *iv.* 90 Council of (A.D.
 633), *in* 451
 Tralucianism, *iv.* 352
 Trinity, doctrine of the, *iv.* 1-92
 Trice, synod at (A.D. 330), *iv.* 35
 Uphilis, *in* 177, *iv.* 529 See Ap-
 pendix His Eunuchism—Ap-
 pendix
 Urianus, *in* 272, 274.
 Urianus of Smagdanna, *iv.* 64
 Ursinus, *in* 15
 Valens emperor, *in* 99, *iv.* 76
 Valens, monk, *in* 38
 Valens of Mursa, *iv.* 64
 Valentinian I., *in* 98, *iv.* 78
 Valentinian II., *in* 101, 187; *iv.* 91
 Valentinian III., *in* 246, *iv.* 228
 Valds, Arius, *iv.* 92
 Varanes, *in* 159, *iv.* 5
 Vigilantius, *in* 211, 332 Opposed
 to the worship of images, *in.* 478
 Vigilus of Rome, *iv.* 253, 260, 263
 Victorinus, *in* 81
 Vincentius Simensis, Commento-
 rium, *in* 290, *iv.* 387
 Vincentius Victor, *iv.* 353
 Vocatione, gentium liber de, *iv.* 393.
 In favour of the Roman primacy,
in. 239
 Western church, *in* 243, 496. An-
 thropology of the, *iv.* 289.
 Xenayis of Tahal, styled also Philox-
 enos, *in.* 418; *iv.* 240
 Zeno, emperor, *in* 191, *iv.* 239
 Zeno of Verona, *in.* 402, 509
 Zosimus, the Pagan historian, *in.* 132
 Zosimus of Rome, *in.* 247. In the
 Pelagian controversy, *iv.* 320.

END OF VOL. IV.

